



JOINT INFORMATION MEETING AGENDA DOCUMENTATION

PREPARATION DATE: March 5, 2012
MEETING DATE: March 14, 2012

SUBMITTING DEPARTMENT: Town & County Planning
DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS: Tyler Sinclair & Jeff Daugherty
PRESENTER: Bruce Meighen, AECOM

SUBJECT: Comprehensive Plan Character District Review

STATEMENT/PURPOSE

The purpose of this item is to review the Joint Planning Commission Certified Illustration of Our Vision (Character Districts) Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan. Specifically the hearing will be focused on approving the Character Districts with any modifications. The approved Vision, Common Values, and Achieving Our Vision chapters will not be reviewed at this hearing.

BACKGROUND/ALTERNATIVES

At the July 11, 2011 JIM the Town and County entered into a contract with AECOM for development and adoption of the Illustration of Our Vision (Character Districts) chapter of the Comprehensive Plan. The Scope of Work is broken into four phases. This fourth Phase is Planning Commission and Elected Official review and approval of the Character Districts and adoption of the Comprehensive Plan.

On January 11, 2012, the Town Council and Planning Commission held a workshop. On January 12, 2012 the County Commission and Planning Commission held an identical workshop. At each of these workshops, direction was given on substantive (i.e. "red") modifications that should be made to the draft Character Districts. In addition, a list of proposed modifications that would clarify and/or enhance (i.e. "green" modifications) the draft Character Districts was also compiled prior to the January 11th and 12th workshops. These proposed red and green modifications were the basis for the list of modifications considered by the Joint Planning Commissions.

On January 26 and February 8, 2012, the Joint Town and County Planning Commissions received public comment pertaining to the Character Districts, reviewed the draft list of modifications produced at the January 11 and 12 workshops, and identified additions, enhancements, and subtractions to the list. At the conclusion of the hearing on February 8, 2012 the Joint Planning Commissions voted 8-1 (one County and two Town commissioners absent) to adopt Resolution No. 12-001 Certifying the Illustration of Our Vision Chapter of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan as Part of the Comprehensive Master Plan for the Town of Jackson, Wyoming and Teton County, Wyoming. Prior to their votes, each of the

Planning Commissioners made a final statement about the Comprehensive Plan process. Their comments are attached.

Following the Joint Planning Commission's certification, staff made the directed modifications to the document and released the Planning Commission Certified Illustration of Our Vision (Character Districts) for public review on February 24, 2012. A list of the Joint Planning Commission Certified Modifications to the December 5, 2011 Draft Character Districts is attached. The few modifications that were not discussed by the elected officials on January 11 and 12, 2012 are highlighted. Staff was unable to complete one of the Joint Planning Commission Certified Modifications – to include a glossary – by February 24; a draft of the glossary is attached.

Exercise

Following a staff presentation and public comment, a two-part exercise will occur to identify any final modifications needed in order to approve the Character Districts.

1. Each elected official will be asked to:
 - a. identify any modifications certified by the Joint Planning Commissions that need additional discussion; and
 - b. identify any additional modifications that are needed to in order to approve the Character Districts.
2. Once possible modifications are identified, each will be discussed and the elected officials will determine by consensus opinion which of the possible modifications should be made as part of the approval of the Character Districts.

Approval

Once the final list of modifications is compiled, the Town Council and Board of County Commissioners will each vote to approve the Illustration of Our Vision (Character Districts) chapter of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan subject to the list of modifications, housekeeping edits identified by Staff and legal review.

Through public workshops in September and October, an open house in December, Planning Commissioner/Elected Official workshops in January, two Joint Planning Commission hearings, and numerous additional public comments, a wide variety of potential approaches have been identified to implement the approved policies of the community. The current Character Districts are the best possible consensus of those various approaches that the Planning Commission could achieve. While additional word-smithing and other housekeeping edits are needed, Staff believes that the content of the Character Districts is consistent with the already approved chapters of the Comprehensive Plan and can be approved in its current form.

Adoption

Following the hearing, staff will make all approved modifications to the Character Districts. Staff will also make the attached edits to the Vision, Common Values, and Achieving Our Vision chapters to make them consistent with the approved Character Districts. Finally, staff will make any changes to the Vision, Common Values, Achieving Our Vision and Illustration of Our Vision (Character Districts) chapters due to legal review and update the appendices. An approved Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan will be released for public review in April at least 30 days prior to the hearing to consider adoption. In May, a JIM hearing will be held to adopt the updated Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan. Staff requests that the Town Council and Board of County Commissioners set a date for the May adoption hearing following their votes to approve the Character Districts. Staff suggests the evening of May 8 or 9, 2012 from 5:00 pm to 9:00 pm.

Public Comment

Public comment received since January 6, 2012 is attached. Public comment received prior to January 6, 2012 has been previously provided and is available online at www.jackontetonplan.com. Please contact staff if you would like additional copies. Public comment will be taken at the meeting.

FISCAL IMPACT

N/A

STAFF IMPACT

Staff impact related to this item is ongoing with a considerable amount of time being spent by Town and County staff on the Comprehensive Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Town Council and Board of County Commissioners each approve the Illustration of Our Vision (Character Districts) chapter of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan subject to approved modifications, housekeeping edits identified by Staff, and legal review.

ATTACHMENTS

Meeting Agenda

Joint Planning Commission Certified Modifications to the December 5, 2011 Draft

Edits to the Vision, Common Values, and Achieving Our Vision for Consistency with the Character Districts

Draft Comprehensive Plan Glossary

Planning Commissioner February 8, 2012 Final Statements

Public Comment Received since January 6, 2012

LEGAL REVIEW

Legal review of the Illustration of Our Vision (Character Districts) chapter, as well as the approved Vision, Common Value, and Achieving Our Vision chapters is ongoing. A list of the changes made to all chapters due to legal review will be available in April as part of the consideration of adoption of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan.

SUGGESTED MOTIONS

Board of Teton County Commissioners

I move to approve the Illustration of Our Vision chapter of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan dated February 24, 2012 subject to the modifications approved tonight, housekeeping edits identified by Staff, and legal review.

Town Council

I move to approve the Illustration of Our Vision chapter of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan dated February 24, 2012 subject to the modifications approved tonight, housekeeping edits identified by Staff, and legal review.

AGENDA

Character Districts JIM Adoption Hearing

March 14, 2012 - 5:00 pm to 9:00 pm

Goal of the Meeting: Discuss final comments on the Illustration of Our Vision chapter, consider public comments on the chapter, and recommend final refinements to the Illustration of Our Vision chapter for inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan.

Part I: Opening and Public Comment

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks from the Town Mayor and County Commission Chairman.
2. Staff Presentation: Staff will outline the approved Comprehensive Plan's direction, the character district process, and the contents of the Planning Commission Certified Illustration of Our Vision. Staff will present modifications to the draft that were certified by the Joint Planning Commission and highlight the modifications that have not been discussed by the electeds.
3. Public Comment Session (Chaired by Town Mayor and County Commission Chairman) (2 to 3 minutes per speaker) The public will be asked to provide:
Plan enhancements to individual districts that would better meet the Vision and Common Values contained in the approved Plan; other technical recommendations may be provided in writing to staff.

Part II: Discussion

After public comment, AECOM will describe the roles and process for the meeting, and review the list of Joint Planning Commission modifications on which the Town Council and County Commission has not previously provided direction. Elected officials will be asked to flag (1) any modifications on which they have not provided previous direction that they would like to discuss; and (2) any other modifications that require further direction. The consultant will make a list of these changes and a straw poll will be used to determine which flagged modifications the elected officials will discuss. Flagged modifications will then be discussed and voted on individually.

Part III: Approval of the Illustration of Our Vision

Motion to approve the Illustration of Our Vision chapter of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan dated February 24, 2012 subject to the modifications approved tonight, housekeeping edits by staff, and legal review.

Part IV: Next Steps

1. Set a date for adoption of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan. Staff suggests May 8th or 9th from 5:00 to 9:00.
2. Staff will release the approved Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan, including all chapters, in April – 30 days prior to adoption.



Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan Character Districts Joint Planning Certified Commission Modifications to the December 5, 2011 Draft

On January 26 and February 8 the Joint Town/County Planning Commissions held a public hearing to certify the Illustration of Our Vision (Character Districts) with modifications. The Joint Planning Commission certified list of modifications to the December 5, 2011 draft Illustration of Our Vision is below. The starting point for the list was the direction from the January 11 Town Council/Town Planning Commission workshop and January 12 Board of County Commissioners/County Planning Commission workshop. On each evening, after receiving public comment, the Planning Commissioners:

- Identified any modifications to add, enhance or subtract from the list; and then
- Discussed identified modifications individually and provided direction based on group consensus.

The Joint Planning Commission certified modifications have since been incorporated by staff into the February 24, 2012 PC Certified Illustration of Our Vision. Colored modifications in the below table represent direction from the Joint Planning Commissions that differed from the direction given on January 11 by the Town and/or January 12 by the County.

Modifications	Joint Planning Commission certified modifications to the 12/5/11 draft
	Modification consistent with the direction from the 1/11 and/or 1/12 workshops
Green	Modification not discussed at the 1/11 or 1/12 workshop
Yellow	Modification clarifies direction given at the 1/11 and/or 1/12 workshops
Red	Modification differs from the direction given at the 1/11 and/or 1/12 workshops

In addition to the differences between the workshop direction and Joint Planning Commission direction identified in the table below, two modifications identified in the January 11 and 12 workshops were removed from the Joint Planning Commission certified list.

District 2: Town Commercial Core – Allow three stories throughout district with a feathering out from the Town Square, and consider four stories with proper design considerations

Subarea 5.6: Northwest South Park – If developed the subarea should include redundant streets (grid/alleys), small lots, and a small area of mixed-use; but industrial is not appropriate.

12/5/11 Illustration of Our Vision Component (Character District)		Joint Planning Commission Certified Modification
IV	Illustration of Our Vision	Edit to improve word choice and remove typos without changing the intent.
		Ensure concepts are referred to consistently throughout the Chapter (e.g. a "subarea" is always referred to as a "subarea").
		Ensure Character Defining Features illustrations and pictures match text.
		Remove unnecessary phrases within sentences such as "in this area," and "in this district."
		Refine maps to be more legible and properly aligned.
		Clarify throughout Character Districts that realization of future character will respect private property rights.
		Provide greater continuity in Character Defining Features Maps by including features from adjacent Character Districts and consistently addressing features such as workforce housing.
		More directly link the description of future characteristics to achieving each Common Value.
		Ensure that a stated desire for workforce housing character does not imply a requirement for deed restriction upon resale.
		Ensure that yards, landscaping, and small footprints are encouraged for single-family, detached dwellings in Town.
I	Introduction	Focus Character District language on area specific goals; remove regulatory language and preference for certain implementation tools (e.g. house size limits).
		Add a glossary.
I.Why	Why Illustrate the Vision	Reformat the introduction to more clearly state the function and interrelationship of the Character Districts, and their relationship to the Vision, Common Values, and Growth Management Plan.

12/5/11 Illustration of Our Vision Component (Character District)		Joint Planning Commission Certified Modification
		<p>Ensure the discussion of the focus of Rural Areas and Complete Neighborhoods in the opening paragraph is consistent with Principles 3.1 and 3.2 defining each classification.</p> <p>In the Complete Neighborhood + Rural Area Table:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicate the classification of each district. • Add a legend explaining the full, half, and empty circles.
		<p>Ensure that the phrase, "most of the community would agree" in the Areas of Transition definition does not imply requirement of a referendum.</p>
		<p>Ensure that the definition of Areas of Conservation clearly conveys a goal of reducing development impacts to open space and wildlife habitat protection.</p>
		<p>Clarify the purpose of the transect as a continuum of neighborhood forms that depicts the relationship between the character defining patterns and intensities of the community.</p>
I.How	How is the Vision Illustrated	<p>Revise the transect graphic to be more consistent with the Character Defining Features descriptions to ensure that the individual Neighborhood Forms add additional clarity to the description of each District's character.</p> <p>In the table under the transect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Label Size as "acres" • Include limited footprint of development along with limited house size under Special Considerations for Habitat/Scenic. • Under Size for Clustering replace 160 with 35 and add respect for private property rights under Special Considerations. • Ensure goal of improved wildlife habitat, open space and scenic protection is clear under Special Considerations for Clustering. • Include integrated transportation planning under Special Considerations for Clustering.
I.What	What Does the Illustration Address	<p>Under #2: Complete Neighborhood + Rural Table:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add the classification (Complete Neighborhood or Rural Area) as the table heading in each District. • Clarify the purpose of full, half, and empty circles as representing the presence, partial presence, or general absence of a characteristic in the District. <p>Delete the second "elements of" in #3: Existing + Future Characteristics text.</p> <p>Indicate the Common Value of each Policy Objective (#4) in each District.</p> <p>Associate Neighborhood Forms (#5) with individual subareas in each District and revise description to be consistent with transect description.</p> <p>Clarify the illustrative intent of the locations of the features shown on Character Defining Features (#6) maps.</p> <p>Add "is" between "map not" in #6: Character Defining Features Map text.</p>

12/5/11 Illustration of Our Vision Component (Character District)		Joint Planning Commission Certified Modification
1	Town Square	<p>Expand the Town Square Character District and the protected historic experience to the west one block with the northern extent of the expansion area being the buildings fronting Deloney Avenue.</p> <p>Limit buildings facing the Square to two stories; allow three stories elsewhere in the District.</p>
1.1	Town Square	<p>Add 4.2.f as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.</p> <p>Clarify the intent to consider temporary and permanent closure of streets for use by motorized vehicles.</p> <p>Clarify that closure of streets, parking lots, parks and other public spaces will be encouraged in order to promote community events.</p> <p>Clarify that underground parking is also an option in the District.</p>
2	Town Commercial Core	<p>Add a half-circle under Future Viable Wildlife Habitat + Connectivity to represent desired Flat Creek enhancement.</p> <p>Add 4.1.d as a Policy Objective as the District has four mixed-use subareas</p> <p>Add 6.2.b as a Policy Objective and discuss more explicitly in District text.</p> <p>Add 6.2.c as a Policy Objective and discuss more explicitly in District text.</p> <p>Add 6.3.a as a Policy Objective and discuss more explicitly in District text.</p> <p>Remove 6.3.e as a Policy Objective as it is a non-locational policy.</p> <p>Add 7.1.c as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.</p> <p>Remove 7.2.a as a Policy Objective as it is applicable communitywide.</p> <p>Add emphasis on reincorporating Flat Creek into the community.</p> <p>Clarify the role of Snow King Avenue as a major transportation corridor.</p>
2.1	Snow King Resort	Clarify the size and scale of structures appropriate in the subarea instead of referring to them as, "much larger than those typically allowed in other areas of town."
2.2	Snow King and South Cache Corridors	Replace "Center of the Arts" with "Center for the Arts."
2.3	Downtown	<p>Revise to reflect that this subarea should only be the starting point for a more detailed discussion of the Lodging Overlay boundary and the regulations on the type and size of lodging desired.</p> <p>Clarify that lodging is also allowed in the Town Square District.</p> <p>Elaborate on how development will be designed to enhance Flat Creek.</p>
2.4	Public/Civic	Reword the last sentence to clarify the Character District would need to be amended.
2.5	North Cache Gateway	<p>Add a desire for stepped-back design of three story structures to reduce the appearance of additional height.</p> <p>Ensure Flat Creek is identified as a recreational and public access amenity.</p>

12/5/11 Illustration of Our Vision Component (Character District)		Joint Planning Commission Certified Modification
3	Town Residential Core	Remove 4.1.c as a Policy Objective as it is applicable Townwide.
		Add 4.3.a as a Policy Objective as the District has two stable neighborhoods.
		Add 4.3.b as a Policy Objective as the District has one transitional neighborhood.
		Remove 4.3.S.2 as a Policy Objective as it is a strategy not a policy.
		Add 7.1.c as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Remove 7.2.a as a Policy Objective as it is applicable communitywide.
		Ensure the goal of quality connection of neighborhoods to parks is clear.
		Rewrite so that the end of the first paragraph and beginning of the second are not the same words.
3.1	East Jackson	Revise language from “pulling buildings to the street” to “pulling buildings toward the street.”
3.2	Core Residential	Revise to allow only 2 stories generally; and only allow 3 stories in specific cases with proper design. Revise to allow nonresidential use fronting Willow Street, similar to South Cache subarea. Ensure that the desire for reinvestment, redevelopment, and revitalization is clear.
3.3	Institutional Area	
3.4	Multi-family Area	Rewrite to describe the stable character as two story.
3.5	East Broadway Mixed Use	Move the subarea to District 2: Town Commercial Core as the subarea character is more consistent with the District 2 character. Clarify the desire for local convenience commercial in this subarea.
4	Mid Town	Clarify that the desire is to locate lodging downtown, but not restrict continuation of existing lodging in Mid-Town.
		Add 1.1.c as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Add 4.1.d as a Policy Objective as the District has two mixed-use subareas.
		Add 4.3.a as a Policy Objective as the District has one stable neighborhood.
		Add 4.3.b as a Policy Objective as the District has one transitional neighborhood.
		Add 5.2.d as a Policy Objective and discuss more explicitly in District text.
		Add 5.3.b as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Add 7.1.c as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Remove 7.2.a as a Policy Objective as it is applicable communitywide.
		Add 7.2.d as a Policy Objective and ensure an upgrade to Snow King – Maple Way is addressed in the District text.
		Increase the emphasis on incorporating Flat Creek into the community.
		Clarify the desire for buildings to address the street without requiring all parking to be placed in the rear.

12/5/11 Illustration of Our Vision Component (Character District)		Joint Planning Commission Certified Modification
4.1	Highway Corridor	Revise the text and boundary of the subarea to allow four stories north of Broadway where it can be built into the hillside and encourage the design to be stepped-back.
		Clarify that office uses will also be allowed in the subarea.
		Address pedestrian crossing of Broadway where development exists, or will exist, on both side of the road.
		Clarify the desire for a transportation network that is convenient for locals, not auto-oriented.
		Clarify that setbacks and landscaping should be proportional to road width and provide screening; and that parking should be off-street in the rear.
4.2	Northern Hillside	Clarify that height should be limited to two stories.
4.3	Central	
4.4	Residential	
4.5	Karns Meadow	Include the connectivity goal of connecting Broadway to Snow King in the western portion of the subarea.
		Ensure that wildlife is the priority over, rather than "balanced with", recreational amenities.
5	West Jackson	Add 4.1.b as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Add 4.1.d as a Policy Objective as the District has two mixed-use subareas.
		Add 4.2.c as a Policy Objective as the District has two mixed-use subareas.
		Add 4.3.a as a Policy Objective as the District has one stable neighborhood.
		Add 4.3.b as a Policy Objective as the District has two transitional neighborhoods.
		Remove 5.2.b as a Policy Objective as it is applicable communitywide.
		Add 5.3.b as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Add 6.2.b as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Add 6.2.c as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Add 7.1.c as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
5.1	Highway Corridor	Add discussion of connectivity to the residential area as shown on map.
		Address the desire for consolidation of highway access points.
		Clarify the use of auto dealers as an example of a necessary single use.
5.2	Gregory Lane Area	Make language more consistent with subarea 7.1: South Park Business Park.
		Enhance livability language to discuss better integration of residents into the subarea through design.

12/5/11 Illustration of Our Vision Component (Character District)		Joint Planning Commission Certified Modification
		Clarify that only accessory residential use is desired as light industrial use is the priority.
5.3	South Park Loop Road	
5.4	School Campuses	Restate "improved alternative mode connectivity" in layman's terms.
5.5	West Jackson Residential	Clarify the desire for a sense of ownership rather than ownership of units.
5.6	Northwest South Park	<p>Revise to link the ability to develop the subarea to a Growth Management Program trigger, without precluding the opportunity for a project that provides meaningful permanent open space by clustering or transferring development into the subarea.</p> <p>Clarify that a solution is needed to congestion on High School Road, but that a new East/West connector road is just one possible option.</p>
6	Town Periphery	Remove 4.1.c as a Policy Objective as it is applicable Townwide.
		Remove 7.2.a as a Policy Objective as it is applicable communitywide.
		Remove the half-circle under Future Walkable Schools, Commercial + Recreation as no amenities are to be added.
		Add a half-circle under Future Abundance of Landscape Over Built Form as the current character is to be maintained.
		Clarify the desire for site design that increases wildlife permeability.
		Clarify that the District is a Complete Neighborhood and not a Rural Area because of its location in Town and relative density to other Rural Areas.
		Mention pathways where START and pedestrian travel are discussed in the introduction.
6.1	Low to Medium Density Neighborhoods	Address the steep slopes, avalanche terrain, and wildlife habitat that should influence design in the subarea.
		Focus on wildlife permeability as a goal rather than specific tools such as fence removal.
6.2	Upper Cache	Clarify wildlife permeability and character preservation purposes in relation to fencing and equestrian goals.
6.3	Snow King Slope	

12/5/11 Illustration of Our Vision Component (Character District)		Joint Planning Commission Certified Modification
7	South Highway 89	Replace 3.1.d with 3.2.b as a Policy Objective, as 3.2.b is more appropriate for an area suitable for nonresidential development.
		Remove 5.2.e as a Policy Objective as it is applicable communitywide.
		Remove 6.3.d as a Policy Objective as it is a non-locational policy.
		Remove half of the circle under Future Natural Scenic Vistas as scenic is not the priority of the entire District.
		Add a half-circle under Existing Limited, Detached Residential as it is true of one of the subareas.
7.1	South Park Business Park	Clarify the desire for protection of wildlife habitat and permeability and open space within the context of the suitable development.
		Amend the second to last sentence to read, "Development and redevelopment will avoid crucial wildlife habitat and movement corridors on the hillsides as well as riparian areas."
		Revise the use discussion to remove reference to allowance for high-tech/R&D and prohibition of retail and office and focus only on the priority of light industrial use.
		Address the connection of Southern South Park (10.1) to the convenience commercial as discussed in the District 10: South Park.
7.2	Hog Island Home Business	Address the implications of industrial mixed-use living for families.
		Clarify the desire for screening, but not at the detriment of the ability to develop light industrial use.
		Clarify the intent to protect a scenic view along the highway through the subarea.
8	River Bottom	Remove 1.1.g as a Policy Objective as it is applicable communitywide.
		Add 3.1.c as a Policy Objective as the District is a Rural Area.
		Remove half of the circle under Future Natural Scenic Vistas as only part of the district meets the definition of scenic.
		Discuss "management" of river access in Existing + Future Desired Characteristics text similarly to how it is discussed in the subareas.
		Clarify that, "public and commercial access to the levee will be ..."
8.1	Solitude/John Dodge/ Tucker/Linn	Include consideration of incentives for reducing density and impacts to wildlife.
8.2	Large Parcels	
8.3	Canyon Corridor	Clarify the desire for conservation rather than subdivision.
		Ensure highway wildlife permeability and scenic goals are clear.
8.4	Hoback Junction	
9	County Valley	Add 3.1.c as a Policy Objective as the District is a Rural Area.
		Add Puzzle Face to the list of ranches in the District.
9.1	Jackson Hole Golf and Tennis	Clarify the desire for local convenience commercial within existing development if possible.
9.2	Agricultural Foreground	Address the desire to bury overhead power lines along Highway 22 if possible.

12/5/11 Illustration of Our Vision Component (Character District)		Joint Planning Commission Certified Modification
9.3	Nethercott/Wenzel/ 3 Creek/Lower Melody	Clarify the desire for conservation rather than subdivision.
9.4	Gros Ventre Buttes	Clarify the desire for conservation rather than subdivision.
10	South Park	Add 3.1.c as a Policy Objective as the District is a Rural Area. Clarify the goal of directing development that does occur into a transition area or clustering it near existing development with the incorporation of permanent open space.
10.1	Southern South Park	
10.2	Central South Park	Clarify the goal of directing development that does occur into a transition area or clustering it near existing development with the incorporation of permanent open space.
11	Wilson	Remove 5.2.e as a Policy Objective as it is applicable communitywide. Remove 6.2.b as a Policy Objective as it is inconsistent with the District's goals. Add 6.2.c as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District. Clarify that Wilson should serve residents and people otherwise passing through Wilson, not attract trips as a destination commercial center.
11.1	Wilson Commercial Core	
11.2	Wilson Townsite	Clarify that accessory residential units are part of the allowable character.
11.3	Wilson Meadows	
11.4	South Wilson	Clarify that the desired density is one unit per three acres or less as is the case today.
12	Aspens/Pines	Add 5.2.d as a Policy Objective and discuss more explicitly in District text. Add 6.2.c as a Policy Objective and discuss more explicitly in District text.
12.1	Aspens/Pines Commercial Core	Clarify illustration to better indicate which direction is north.
12.2	390 Residential Core	Reclassify as a Stable area with a similar description to subarea 12.4, calling for preservation of the existing residential pattern.
12.3	Aspens/Pines Residential	
12.4	390 Residential South	Clarify that the stable character is that of 1 acre or greater lot size.

12/5/11 Illustration of Our Vision Component (Character District)		Joint Planning Commission Certified Modification
13	Teton Village	Revise to allow for more potential housing and locally oriented commercial without increasing the Village footprint. Additional units should be designed with the goal of year-round residency, address transportation issues, and result in direction of development out of rural areas.
		Emphasize the desire for combination and coordination of the Master Plans into a comprehensive Village plan with the goal of creating a functioning, sustainable resort community.
		Acknowledge that Master Plan conversations will reopen discussion of commercial allowances.
		Include a general desire for wildlife permeability in the District.
		Add 5.2.d as a Policy Objective and discuss more explicitly in District text.
		Add 6.3.a as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Add a half-circle under Existing Walkable Schools, Commercial + Recreation as some areas are within walking distance of amenities.
		Add additional discussion of the resort character of the District.
13.1	Teton Village Commercial Core	
13.2	Teton Village Residential Core	Include allowance for more potential housing consistent with the modified future desired character for the District.
13.3	Teton Village Single Family	Include allowance for more potential housing consistent with the modified future desired character for the District.
14	Alta	Add 1.1.b as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Add 3.1.c as a Policy Objective as the District is a Rural Area.
		Add 5.3.b as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Remove 6.3.d as a Policy Objective as it is a non-locational policy.
		Replace 7.2.c with 7.3.a as a Policy Objective as 7.3.a is more appropriate as a Policy Objective for a specific roadway connection project.
14.1	Alta Farmland	
14.2	Alta Core	In the third sentence change the second "character" to "lots."
14.3	Grand Targhee Resort	Clarify that the Targhee Master Plan should not expand.

12/5/11 Illustration of Our Vision Component (Character District)		Joint Planning Commission Certified Modification
		Focus character discussion on reducing impacts and maintaining outlying communities.
15	County Periphery	Add 1.2.a as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District. Add 3.1.c as a Policy Objective as the District is a Rural Area. Add 3.5.a as a Policy Objective and discuss more explicitly in District text. Add 5.3.b as a Policy Objective and discuss in new Buffalo Valley subarea text. Remove 6.3.e as a Policy Objective as it is a non-locational policy. Ensure the prioritization of conservation is clear. Address open space, scenic and habitat preservation as goals not negative impacts of development.
15.1	Large Outlying Parcels	Clarify the desire for on-site renewable energy.
15.2	Buffalo Valley Residential/ Game Creek/South Fall Creek	Clarify the desire for conservation rather than subdivision. Replace the desire to "restore" wildlife permeability with a desire to "enhance."
15.3	Buffalo Valley Highway Ranches	Recognize Buffalo Valley as a separate subarea emphasizing gateway character and scenic value and encouraging convenience commercial and maintenance of existing character.
15.4	Kelly	Delete reference to START service to Kelly as a priority. Ensure it is clear that live/work is not discouraged.



Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan Character Districts

Edits to the Vision, Common Values, and Achieving Our Vision for Consistency with the Character Districts

The Vision, Common Values, and Achieving Our Vision chapters of the Comprehensive Plan approved on June 29, 2011 anticipate the addition of the Illustration of Our Vision chapter (Character Districts) and include references to the Character Districts. With the Character Districts now refined, some clarifying edits are needed to the approved policies. The table below identifies the edits that would be required to make the approved Vision, Common Values, and Achieving Our Vision chapters consistent with the PC Certified Illustration of Our Vision chapter. The edits fall into three basic categories.

Edit
Replace transect or other graphic with updated version approved in Character Districts.
Update word choice to be consistent with Character District organization.
Update content to be consistent with approved Character District policy.

#	Policy	pg	Required Edit
ToC	Table of Contents	i	Update Illustration of Our Vision to include Character Districts
ES.F.CV	Plan Framework: Common Values	ES-8,9	Update transect
ES.F.IV	Plan Framework: Illustration of Our Vision	ES-11	Update text and graphic to be consistent with approved Illustration of Our Vision chapter text and graphics
ES.H.PUP	Plan Highlights: Plan Update Process	ES-12	Update process timeline
ES.H.IPT	Plan Highlights: Innovative Planning Tools	ES-15	Update Illustration of Our Vision list based on approved Illustration of Our Vision
1.1.b	Protect wildlife from the impacts of development	CV-1-5	Update transect
1.4	Conserve remaining undeveloped open space	CV-1-11	Update transect Add discussion of preservation subareas where appropriate within Principle or Policies
2.2	Reduce energy consumption through land use	CV-1-17	Update transect
CV2.Why	Why is Managed Growth a Common Value	CV-2-1	Update to reflect that stable and transitional areas comprise about 7% of private land
3.Why	Why is [Responsible Growth Management] addressed?	CV-2-2	Update development pattern continuum and stable/transition language to be consistent with the approved Illustration of Our Vision Update page CV-2-3 graphic
3.1	Direct growth out of habitat, scenery and open space	CV-2-6	Update transect Add discussion of conservation and preservation subareas where appropriate within Principle or Policies
3.1.c	Maintain rural character outside of complete neighborhoods	CV-2-7	Modify building size language to be consistent with, "historic agricultural compound," language used in Character Districts
3.2	Enhance suitable locations into complete neighborhoods	CV-2-8	Update transect
3.2.a	Enhance the quality, desirability, and integrity of complete neighborhoods	CV-2-8	Insert language relating building size to parcel size consistent with direction regarding building size

#	Policy	pg	Required Edit
3.3.b	Illustrate growth management through character districts	CV-2-10	Update policy language to be consistent with the approved Illustration of Our Vision
3.3.d	Develop neighborhood plans	CV-2-11	Update Character District references to be consistent with the approved Illustration of Our Vision
3.2.S.4	Section 3 Strategies	CV-2-14	Update strategy to include more housing consistent with future District 13: Teton Village Character
4	Town as the Heart of the Region – The Central Complete Neighborhood	CV-2-16	Throughout the Section ensure that words such as “district” “area” “subarea” “stable” “transitional” and the title “Character Districts” are used consistently with the approved Illustration of Our Vision
4.1.c	Promote compatible infill and redevelopment that fits Jackson’s neighborhoods		Insert language relating building size to parcel size consistent with direction regarding building size
4.2	Promote vibrant, walkable mixed use districts	CV-2-20	Update transect
4.2.f	Maintain lodging as a key component in the downtown	CV-2-20	Delete last sentence referring to the specific location of the Lodging Overlay being identified in the Character Districts
4.3	Develop desirable residential areas	CV-2-21	Update transect
4.4.b	Enhance Jackson Gateways	CV-2-22	Update gateway map to be consistent with Character District symbology
4.Strat	Section 4 Strategies	CV-2-24	Add establish a boundary and associated regulations and incentives for the Lodging Overlay
5.2	Strategically locate a variety of housing types	CV-3-5	Update transect
5.2.b	Housing will be consistent with Character Districts	CV-3-5	Modify the title “Character Districts” to language consistent with the approved Illustration of Our Vision
7.3	Coordinate land use and transportation planning	CV-3-22	Update transect
8.Why	Why is [Quality Community Service Provision] addressed?	CV-3-27	Update transect
9.1.b	Ensure growth occurs in suitable locations	AV-5	Identify stable and transitional subareas as the suitable locations for growth



Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan

DRAFT Glossary: March 9, 2012

Accessory Residential Unit (ARU). An Accessory Residential Unit is a dwelling unit, which is clearly incidental and subordinate to the principal residential or nonresidential use of the property. An ARU meets the definition of a dwelling unit, which is a building or portion of a building containing one or more rooms, a separate bathroom and a single kitchen, designed for occupancy by one family for residential purposes.

Affordable Housing. Housing units for lower- and middle-income residents earning no more than one hundred seventy-five (175) percent of the median Teton County income at the time the unit is rented or purchased. Such housing shall cost no more than thirty (30) percent of the occupants' total monthly income. Affordable housing can include owner-occupied or rental dwelling units.

Alternative Transportation. A transportation method such as transit, bicycling or walking that is an alternative to travel by private motor vehicle.

Best Management Practices. Methods and techniques found to be the most effective or practical for achieving an objective.

Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). A short-term plan that identifies capital projects and equipment purchases, provides a planning schedule, and identifies financing options.

Character District. An area with common natural, visual, cultural and physical attributes, shared values and social interaction.

Clustering. Grouping development on a portion of the development site for purposes of providing open space to protect wildlife habitat, wildlife movement, scenic resources, and/or agriculture.

Commercial Use. A subset of nonresidential uses, such as office, retail and services.

Common Values. The three mutually-supportive values shared by the community that fulfill our Community's Vision - Ecosystem Stewardship, Managed Growth and Community Character. Each Common Value is composed of the Principles and Policies of the community.

Community Character. A combination of natural physical character, western heritage, high quality design, and unique local identity that defines the Jackson/Teton County community.

Community Vision. The basis for the Comprehensive Plan that informs the policies that describe our Common Values. Our Vision is to, "Preserve and protect the area's ecosystem in order to ensure a healthy environment, community, and economy for current and future generations."

Complete Neighborhood. A Complete Neighborhood is a character district that provides: defined character and high quality design; access to public utilities such as water, sewer and storm sewer; quality public spaces; a variety of housing types; schools, childcare, commercial, recreation and other amenities within walking distance (1/4 to ½ mile) of residences; and, connection by complete streets that are safe for all modes of travel.

Complete Street. Street designed and operated to enable safe access for all users. Pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists and transit riders of all ages and abilities must be able to safely move along and across a complete street.

Connectivity. Ensuring linkage and access between existing County neighborhoods and the Town of Jackson, within existing complete neighborhoods, and between future and existing development through a viable multi-modal transportation system.

Context Sensitive Design. Roadway standards and development practices that are flexible and sensitive to community values, allowing transportation system design to better balance and support our Common Values.

Local Convenience Commercial. Nonresidential use that serves the year-round residents of the area in which it is located, such as markets or groceries, pharmacies, eateries, day cares and dry cleaning/laundry or banking services.

Cumulative Impacts. The combined, incremental effects of development activity. Although the impact of any individual development activity may be insignificant, their combined impacts over time can be measureable and significant.

Deed-Restriction. A legal restriction placed on a dwelling unit that ensures that future sale or rent of the unit meets certain standards. Often refers to an income restriction for a potential buyer or renter, preservation of the future mortgage or rent payments at an affordable level, or preservation of the unit as workforce housing available only to individuals employed in Teton County.

Development Potential. The amount and type of future development that could occur under current regulation and/or state statute. Development Potential is determined by subtracting existing development from the maximum possible development on each parcel.

Eco-Tourism. Tourism that promotes energy efficient and low impact enjoyment of the ecosystem by profiting on the community's natural capital while promoting ecological conservation and stewardship.

Employee Housing. A dwelling unit that is restricted to occupation by a person, and that person's family, employed within Teton County, Wyoming.

Focal Species. A group of species that indicate the health of all native species and includes culturally and economically significant species.

Growth Management. Proactively planning for what we want – rural open spaces and highquality, desirable complete neighborhoods. If the most ecologically suitable plasces for development ar also the most desirable places to live, or ecosystem and community character will both benefit.

Guesthouse. An accessory residential unit occupied by guests of the residents of the principle dwelling free of charge. In some cases a guesthouse may also be rented long-term to a member of the local workforce.

Home Business. A business conducted outside a residential dwelling, but on the same lot and in conjunction with a residential dwelling, that is owned and operated by a person residing the dwelling.

Illustration of our Vision. A chapter in the Comprehensive Plan that defines the desired character for specific areas of the County and depicts relevant policies of the community's Common Values within the specific area.

Indirect Impacts. Impacts of a development activity that occur at a different time or place from the development activity itself. Indirect impacts are often considered a subset of cumulative impacts.

Infill. The process of developing or redeveloping vacant or underused parcels within existing developed areas or complete neighborhoods.

Level of Service (LOS). The quality and quantity of service provided to the community. In transportation, a qualitative measure that describes traffic conditions in terms of speed, travel time, freedom to maneuver, comfort, convenience, traffic interruptions and safety.

Live/Work. A building or spaces within a building used jointly for commercial and residential purposes where the residential use of the space is secondary or accessory to the primary use as a place of work.

Lodging Overlay. An identification of the lands within the Town that are appropriate for lodging uses in order to maintain a balance between the amount of lodging uses and other visitor and resident-oriented uses and services.

Mitigation. The offsetting or reduction of the impacts of a development on a stated community goal.

Mixed Use. Locating residential, commercial and other nonresidential uses in a single building or development.

Natural Capital. The extension of the economic notion of capital to the natural environment. Natural Capital is thus the stock of the ecosystem that yields a continued flow of valuable ecosystem functions in the future—those parts of the ecosystem critical to continued healthy ecosystem function.

Natural Resources Overlay (NRO). A zoning overlay that protects wildlife habitat and wildlife movement corridors. It is currently defined as elk, moose, mule deer, bald eagle and trumpeter swan crucial winter habitat; elk and mule deer migration corridors; bald eagle and trumpeter swan nesting areas; and cutthroat trout spawning areas.

Neighborhood Form. The general pattern and intensity of development representative of a certain character.

Nonresidential Use. Nonresidential use is a use other than residential, which includes agricultural, institutional, commercial, recreation/resort, industrial, and aeronautical uses as well as home and temporary uses.

Peak Effective Population. The peak population actually in the community during a season including year-round residents, present part-time residents, and visitors.

Planned Resort. A master planned area that encourages recreational activities that rely on natural attributes of the area, contributes to community character and economy, and provides quality visitor experiences. A Planned Resort contains a mix of land uses, both residential and nonresidential, is pedestrian-oriented and provides access to alternative modes of transportation.

Redundancy (transportation). The concept of a transportation network that encompasses multiple and alternate routes to prevent the overburdening of certain transportation routes and to ensure continued access should a road or bridge close due to a natural hazard or other event.

Riparian Area. Ecosystems that occur along waterbodies, including stream or riverbanks, floodplains, lakeshores and wetlands.

Rural Areas of Preservation. Subareas in which no change to the existing undeveloped character of the scenic resources and wildlife habitat is necessary, where additional amenities and infrastructure are inappropriate, but which may benefit from clustered residential development that improves preservation of open space.

Rural Neighborhoods with Conservation Opportunities. Subareas of existing development and platted neighborhoods with high wildlife values where development and redevelopment should focus on improved conservation, that would benefit from increase in open space, scenic resources and habitat enhancement, and where the goals include balancing existing development with improved wildlife permeability and scenic enhancements.

Open Space. Undeveloped wildlife habitat and migration corridors; scenic vistas and natural skylines; natural waterbodies, floodplains and wetlands; agricultural land; and areas of active recreation that relieve recreation pressure in areas of greater ecological value.

Scenic Resources Overlay (SRO). A zoning overlay intended to preserve and maintain the County's most frequently viewed scenic resources that are important to both its character and economy. In Scenic Areas within the SRO, the location, design and landscaping of development is regulated so that the development preserves, maintains or complements the County's important scenic resources.

Skyline. The visual line at which the earth or vegetation and the sky appear to meet. The skyline is typically viewed as the top of a ridge, hillside or butte.

Stability, Complete Neighborhood Areas of. Subareas in which no change to the existing character is necessary and any new development will be infill that maintains the existing identity or vitality of the area, but which may benefit from strategic infill or development of non-existing Complete Neighborhood amenities.

Stewardship. The careful and responsible management of something entrusted to one's care. Often used in reference to, the care and management of the local ecosystem to ensure the maintenance of the health of native species, water and air quality, scenic resources, undeveloped open space, and climate sustainability for current and future generations.

Sustainability. A system of practices that are healthy for the environment, community and economy and can be maintained for current and future generations.

Suitable Location (for development). Subareas of Stability and Transition.

Transition, Complete Neighborhood Areas of. Subareas where most of the community would agree that development and redevelopment or a change in character would be beneficial. These subareas would benefit from reinvestment and revitalization, with the goals for development including improving access to jobs, housing and services and reducing reliance on single-occupancy trips.

Transect. A continuum of Neighborhood Forms that make up our community and shows the relationship between the various development patterns and intensities that define our character.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM). A strategy that changes how, when and/or where people travel by providing incentives and disincentives to influence travelers to change their travel behavior in ways that reduce demand on the transportation system, make more efficient use of the current roadway system and reduce the need to add additional roadway capacity.

Viewshed. The area visible from a fixed vantage point, often of particular scenic value and readily visible from roadways or other public areas.

Wildlife Friendly Fencing. Fencing designed to be permeable to wildlife movement, typically by limiting the height of the fence and making use of certain materials and spacing of wires and posts.

Workforce Housing. Local market and deed-restricted housing occupied by people working locally who would otherwise commute from outside the community.



Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan Character Districts Planning Commissioner Final Comments from February 8, 2012

Michael Pruett

I am one of those people who have been in on the process since the very beginning, since the first meeting at St. John's, etc. I chaired those meetings for awhile, so it has been a long process, and I think it has been sometimes painful but a very positive process. I know the public has gotten tired of a lot of this stuff and they've made a lot of comment about that, but overall I think that having two boards combined like this, although it's been very difficult, I think ultimately we brought up some very, very difficult issues that we've had to work through with the public. And I think these Planning Commissioners, all of the people who have been involved now and in the past, really have done a good job of working through those.

I would say that not...a sign to me of a good Plan is when you don't get everything that you want, and I can personally say I've not gotten everything I want out of this Plan, but I can say that I've gotten a lot of what I would like to see for this Valley. And my feeling about that is that I think the two planning boards have listened very carefully to the public opinion. We've...boy, have we listened to a lot of public opinion and public comment. And I think overall we've done a very good job of taking the Plan that was given us from day one and really, really scaling it back. I know that might not feel that way to a lot of people, but I think that is the overall end result of where we are today, because what we had before is very different from what we have right now.

So, overall, I can say I'm overall very happy with moving forward. I think there are...I think this Plan does fix a lot of transparency and clarity problems that were in the '94 Plan. I think it is a step forward. I think the challenges that we've faced with the public is bringing these issues to light that weren't identified in the '94 Plan. So, by bringing those to light, it causes controversy and question and I think we've done a good job overall, the public, Planning Department and our boards, of really addressing very, very difficult issues. I don't think we've fixed everything. I don't think this is a silver bullet by any means. I don't think this will carry us for 20 years, but I think it is a very good step forward.

A couple more final comments—I know I'm a little long-winded, I'm sorry, but this has been a long process...I do...I think that there's two things that I would say I'm a little bit...I have a little bit of angst about. My first one is that we didn't put a little bit more emphasis on property rights overall in the Plan, both in the County and the Town. I think we took a very long hard look at housing, wildlife and things like that, and I think we probably could have gone a little bit stronger on property rights. And my hope in this Plan, and with the electeds specifically, is that, when they look at this, they really take a hard look at those and make sure that those are protected for the public.

My other feeling of angst I would say is I think we need...and my advice or solution...my advice to the electeds and looking forward is I think we need to take a really, really strong look communitywide at our housing program. There's been a lot of public opinion about housing when that came up. We spent a lot of time on that chapter. I know it was a new chapter as of the '94 Plan and we have come a long way since '94, but I think we've gone off our path and I think we need to really take about three steps back on our housing program and the way it's set up today, and look at how we can come up with some very strong market-rate...or market solutions, free-market solutions. I know there's members of this public that are here who are on a housing committee that I think came up with some *super* suggestions on how we can take our

program today and make it better, and I think we really...and I would strongly encourage our electeds to take a really hard look at that and make some very, very big changes to our housing program. I think we can accomplish the goals that we want but still have a free-market solution and still get what we want from the public.

Overall, I think that's really pretty much my comments. Overall, I am pleased with where we've come. It has been difficult and frustrating, but overall I'm pleased with what the public has done and their input. And I know the faces that are in here who have been here as much as we have as well. Thanks to the Planning Department and thanks to all the board members who are here and the prior members who served from day one.

Barbara Allen

I am also one of the original members and I also chaired a year of these meetings, and while Michael and I often agree, and I do think that the Planning Commissions have done a great job, and we've listened to so much from expert testimony to public comment, etc. It's been great. It's been super informative. It's been wonderful. And I think we all benefit from the different perspectives that these Commissions have, and I think we've done a great job talking out those differences. Tonight I think we made great strides.

Unfortunately, and I've struggled with this since this whole process started, I can't support these character districts, because I can't support the inherent philosophy behind them, and I don't see how a 40/60 goal can be accomplished in any other way than by padding the 60 and taking from the 40. And so, while I think there's been a lot of great discussion and I support a lot of the things that have been brought up, I inherently stick at that and I think it's inherently depending upon a philosophy of transferrable development rights, and so I can't support these character districts that I don't believe are based on something that works.

Dana Buchwald

I just want to thank the public and Town and County Staff and fellow Commissioners for all their effort and ideas.

John Stennis

I would reiterate Dana's thanks to all the public who's turned out to comment on the Comp Plan, the Staff for their immense amount of time that they spent developing this, and then to all the fellow Commissioners for all the volunteer time that they've put in. It has been a long process, but I feel like the product that we're getting from this is really moving us a huge step forward and it is improving a lot of things that we really didn't like about the '94 Plan. And things that we see in the Valley now, that I think there's a sense that we don't...you know what you have, so you don't...you're worried about what the change will be, and I think we're doing a lot of good things in this Comp Plan that we probably shouldn't be so fearful of. You know, unfortunately, I think, to reiterate Michael's point, that no one Plan can encompass all the ideas presented by the community, but I think we've done as good of a job as we possibly can.

Paul Nash

I, too, want to mirror what Michael had said. I do believe that a Plan that shows a lot of compromise is a Plan that shows how diverse we are as community, so I would like basically not get into where I think we could have done better or could have done...we definitely could have done worse, but kind of stick to that.

What I do want to focus on is going through three sets of thank you's. First and foremost would be to these committees. I think actually getting involved is the best way to adjust the system, and try and get what you want out of a system is actually to get involved. And seeing what, you know, not necessarily myself, but what everybody else has done and given up, as far as their evenings, I applaud that and I think it's certainly noteworthy.

The second would be to Staff, both Town and County. I think they took most of the heat on a lot of the issues and they bared all of the burden of putting together verbiage and keeping us informed, keeping us on track, and ultimately, in my opinion, providing us with a good document. One suggestion I would have moving forward is that they take this experience and take the time to put together what they think in the future would be a better way to move forward, so it doesn't take a long time, so we don't burn out the public, like it's been obvious, and just so the people that are sitting in our positions right now have a better way. Or maybe this speaks to predictability, a more predictable way of how we're going to move forward on this Plan in ten or so years in the future.

And then the third would be mostly to the public, you know, the dedicated few that are here every night and then also the 500+ others that provided us comments and talked to us on the streets and wrote, you know, wrote in what they were thinking and work, jobs, things like that. So, I think that is ultimately what creates this community, this County, and turns it into something more than just a bunch of people living in an area, that we actually are a community.

Mike Hammer

I was not involved in this process. I came here when the electeds were finalizing the words, but I have worked on the '94 Plan and I worked on the 1978 Plan. Interestingly enough, I had a project in 1980 under the PUD Regulations, then the County Plan. They were three pages long and that was it. It's gotten a little more complicated. I read the character districts as implementing the words of the Plan, as proposed, and as driving future zoning and Land Development Regulations. I'm anxious to see LDRs that incent owners and developers to do some remarkable things that encourage what ought to be done, rather than saying what can't be done. And I think this is going in the right direction.

Paul Dunker

I would like to echo previous Commissioners' acknowledgement of Staff and the outstanding job you've all done I think throughout this process. This is the third version of this update that we've worked on and each one has been better than the last and all three of them were better than the Plan we have in place now, so I'm generally very happy with the direction it's all gone.

I'll make one comment to the public in general. In the context of this Plan, there's been a lot of public comment about additive growth. And in the context of this Plan the words permanent conservation and additive growth are almost synonymous. Additive growth is only a byproduct of permanent conservation, so it's not something that we should be afraid of, it's something we should be embracing, because any additive growth means that somewhere else there's some permanent conservation, and that's our number-one priority.

So, I'm...overall, I wish...the only way I think this Plan could have been better—it's the best we're ever going to get and it's a consensus-based Plan—I wish we could have done a little bit more for the large historic landowners who have been such great stewards of our Valley up until now. But they still have the options they had in the last Plan and the door is not shut on developing new ones yet, so I'm optimistic.

Peter Stewart

I also want to reiterate my gratitude to the Staff and to the public. I definitely didn't know what I was getting into. And I had been to a lot of public meetings before, and I appreciate what I've learned. And tonight's public comment really illustrates to me the polarity of opinions in this community and affect the impossibility of creating a Plan that has everything that everybody wants in it. It's just...it's impossible, I mean, that doesn't mean what we have is a poor product—I think it's an exceptional product—but I do think it's time to move it along to the next phase, to the electeds, and to a discussion of the details of how it's going to impact the LDRs and that type of thing.

But I also I do think the character district maps, though imperfect, are a useful tool, because they address one of the public's main concerns, which is predictability, where it's going to be. You know, we're not putting numbers on it, but there's been really good conversations, you know, ever since we started discussing the character district maps. So, though imperfect, I think they're a nice tool.

Mark Newcomb

On any given day of the year, I can experience the wild of our surrounding public lands, expect to see wildlife, inhale clean air, dangle a line into crystal clear water, and finish the day having a locally brewed beer at a locally owned brew pub. This thanks to our unique and sound environment. Furthermore, on any given day I might run into friends that include dishwashers, teachers, real estate brokers, builders, guides, financiers and third and fourth generation land-owners. This thanks to a community that has a place for everyone. This document enshrines balance between our environment and our community.

This document recognizes that ecosystem stewardship is preeminent, that therefore growth should be managed, and that those two efforts taken together will preserve our character. We all recognize that every additional square foot, every additional vehicle on the road, every additional human in Teton County, has an ecological cost. This document recognizes that cost, but more importantly, it recognizes that that cost, foot per foot, car per car, human per human, can be reduced, that the ecological cost of someone moving here tomorrow can and should be lower than someone moving here today.

On the other hand, this document recognizes the rights of property owners. The exercise of those rights can incur an ecological and social cost. The exercise of private property rights can compromise the ecosystem, generate growth and impact community character.

Past development did. Past development under past plans placed 70 odd percent of the dwelling units in our county within wildlife habitat and scenic vistas—the very backbone of our ecosystem. Past development and past plans placed the vast majority of development in the rural county, not in town. In the past, property owners were allowed to exercise their rights often without mitigating the costs to the ecosystem and to our community character.

This plan envisions the ideal that new development and redevelopment will recognize and mitigate ecological costs and will strive to enhance community character. To be clear, under the vision of this plan, development of any degree of intensity can only occur within limited portions of town and to a minor degree in Wilson, the Aspens and Teton Village. Located on a strong network of public transportation, supported by local services that will be enhanced over time, largely outside of crucial wildlife habitat, these are the areas where it just plain makes sense to have the development that houses our workforce and binds our community together.

This plan strives to conserve the maximum amount of open space possible in our rural county, without diminishing the underlying property rights. This plan does not downzone, though it asks a lot of our community's large landowners. Under this plan, they will be asked to address not

just the economic cost of new development, but the ecological and social costs as well. Opportunities to cluster exist in this plan, but only when the additions to open space are identifiable and substantial. And when all is said and done, this plan as structured, envisions an overall build-out less than or equal to what the '94 plan allows for.

Vital to this plan is that it will be monitored and assessed every five years. Managed growth means that every five years the fundamental tenants of this plan—to mitigate our ecological costs and preserve community character—will be evaluated. Key metrics include the 60/40 ratio of development in complete neighborhoods vs. in rural areas and the 65/35 ratio of in-county to commuting workforce.

Many, as have I, recognize that the vision represented in this plan is just that, a vision. Can't it say more, give us more certainty, something more substantial to work with? Some numbers to ponder? Some costs and benefits?

But let's consider where we are, what we have, what we are striving for. Our wildlife, our vistas, our elbow room—these things we take for granted—are community-wide benefits, free and open to all. I can enjoy the open space driving south out of town; you can enjoy the open space driving south out of town; anyone can enjoy the open space driving south out of town. There is only one way we can be excluded from enjoying that view. Land-owners can exercise their constitutional right to utilize their personal property. Yet the constitution also recognizes the right of the community to ask, even to require, that the land-owner acknowledge and address the costs incurred to the community when exercising those rights. Alas such costs are often diffuse, intangible and without price; in other words, highly subjective.

At what point does the size of one's house simply cost the ecosystem and our community too much? At what point does the intensity of a clustered development simply cost the ecosystem and our community too much? How many houses built next to mine are too many? One, three, five, ten? How many houses built on the opposite side of the valley from mine are too many? How long at a stoplight is too long? How many dead ungulates on our roadways is too many? Should the span of sage-brush between my house and those houses yonder still be called open space if transformed into the ninth fairway of a golf course? Should a campground populated with small cabins on wheels still be called a campground?

Wouldn't each and every one of us here tonight love a ten-page, double-spaced document that answered those questions in plain English? But I challenge any of you to find even as few as five other people in this room to sit down together and produce such a document.

Let's be clear. It may cost money, plain and simple, for a landowner not to develop their property. Yet when they do develop, it can inflict ecological and social costs on our community. While these costs may be diffuse, intangible and hard to quantify, they are costs. If we as a community want to address them, or avoid them, we can. We can monetize them, and compensate landowners for the preservation of open space and wildlife habitat. We can make them temporal and accept slower travel speeds, longer waits and the use of public transportation, even when it's a little inconvenient. We can personally internalize them by building smaller houses and living in tighter quarters with our neighbors (and controlling our dogs and scooping their poop....). In reality, all of this, and more, has to happen. But none of it will happen without two things. The first is a vision, which I believe we now have. The second is action, action that must be taken community-wide.

This plan is as much yours as it is mine, or the planning staff's, or our elected officials. If this plan says one thing, it is that we are all in this together. Let us act as a community.

Comp Plan Public Comment (1/6/12 - 3/9/12)

Date	Name	Comment
3/9/2012	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	<p>The Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance is very grateful for all of your hard work throughout this Comprehensive Planning process. As this process nears its conclusion this spring, we wanted to submit the following comments regarding the Implementation Plan.</p> <p>In a 2011 report, "Technical Analysis of Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan," Alan Richman provides the following specific recommendation: "Strategies should be organized into an action plan that establishes priorities for next steps and lays out a timeline for completing projects." The Alliance is glad to see that the creation of such a plan is a priority for the Town and County. As you continue to craft and then finalize this Implementation Plan, we hope that you will address the following comments.</p> <p>Implementation Plan Scope and Format</p> <p>An implementation plan should account for the whole process of Land Development Regulation (LDR) updates, data collection, and monitoring, and be more than a 1-year plan. It should include responsible parties and timelines (for both initiation and completion of various tasks), and serve as a road map for the community to the accomplishment of the goals and implementation of the policies in the Comp Plan. Richman's report also states that an Implementation Plan can come in the "form of a tabular summary of proposed actions, with dates identified for when each will be accomplished and by whom, or it could be in the form of a timeline, with actions shown in the order in which they are intended to be accomplished." Either of these would be a good starting point for our local Implementation Plan.</p> <p>Prioritized Issues</p> <p>This is a prioritized but not exhaustive list of areas to be covered in the Implementation Plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The first priority of the Implementation Plan should be the development of tools for shifting development potential and achieving permanent open space conservation. As a central tenant of the Comp Plan and the concept upon which the achievement of many of the Plan's goals hinge, research and debate about tools to shift development potential should begin immediately. This includes an analysis of the existing tools, specifically the PRD, as well as improvements to our current toolbox.2. Zoning should come after an analysis of the tools that we want to use in this community to shift and direct development, so as not to constrain which tools might be effective in achieving permanent open space, a top community priority.3. Funding sources identified in the Comp Plan (for housing, open space, transportation, etc) should be further explored and initiated immediately.4. Various studies and data collection efforts must be initiated in the near future, including but not limited to an economic analysis of the market and the intersection of the market and the Comp Plan, the housing legal nexus study (underway), and a countywide transportation analysis.5. The lodging overlay in Town and the changes to the boundary suggested in the character district maps should be explored and debated prior to the formal establishment of the overlay. Other outstanding regulatory updates include house size restrictions, incentives and their structure, mitigation fees, and the many other issues called out in the policies for future discussion. Updating the current regulations with regard to these issues to bring them into compliance with the new Comp Plan should be prioritized within the overall LDR update process.6. Baseline data for the Indicators section should be developed and included in the Comp Plan prior to adoption. <p>Growth Management Plan</p> <p>As a part of the Implementation Plan, the Growth Management Plan should be addressed. Specifically, the monitoring program should be further developed to identify additional triggers or timeframes for revisiting how well we are accomplishing our Growth Management goals, such as the northern South Park development trigger. Additionally, the corrective actions, outlined in the Plan, should be more fully explored.</p> <p>Adoption of the Implementation Plan</p> <p>This Implementation Plan should be adopted along with the Comprehensive Plan with the intention that it serve as a road map for the next few years of LRD updates and planning work. Again, as stated in the Richman report, "Prioritization of the actions in the Comprehensive Plan will go a long way towards informing citizens as to what they can expect and will allow them to hold the Town and County accountable for whether progress is being made in Plan implementation." This is an important piece of the final product that will be up for adoption this spring.</p> <p>Lastly, attached [see actual comment for attachment] is the Action Plan for the Aspen Area Community Plan, which you have no doubt seen. This is a specific example of an action plan with clear responsible parties, timelines and priorities that could serve as a model for our local Implementation Plan. Again, thank you for your continuing hard work on this issue. We look forward to engaging with the staff and elected officials as we draw this planning process to a close and launch into the fulfillment of the Implementation Plan.</p>

Date	Name	Comment
3/9/2012	Stennis, John Interested Public	<p>Below is an e-mail I have been circulating to my friends and colleagues in support of the comprehensive plan and to clarify what I feel are inaccuracies in recent advertisements by special interest groups. I hope this helps with your upcoming review of the Comp Plan.</p> <p>Dear Friends and Colleagues,</p> <p>Many of you will pick up the weekly paper and find a number of articles on the Comprehensive Plan along with full page ads paid for by the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, Gail Jensen, South Park Neighbors, Village Road Coalition, Wilson Advisory Committee, Cottonwood Park Neighbors and Save Historic Jackson Hole. These community organizations are asking for a "Statement of Intent in the Comp Plan" among other things. On the surface this may appear a good idea but in essence binds the hands of elected officials and planning staff and essentially turns the current version of the draft Plan into a no growth Plan, making it much more restrictive than the 94' Plan currently in place. If you think current development standards make projects difficult, I can assure you that the conservation for growth approach will make any new project immeasurably more difficult and add immense bureaucratic hurdles. As a member of the design community and a Town of Jackson Planning and Zoning Commissioner, I would like to lend my perspective to a couple of the key views these organizations are asserting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Comp Plan should include calculated numbers for each character district so that the community knows exactly how much growth will occur. The Comp Plan does include documented numbers prepared by Town and County planning staff that are the basis for the rough doubling of units proposed in the current Plan and are based on base property rights of 1 unit per 35 acres. As many of you will understand, it is impossible to make the accurate numbers these organizations are requesting because of the many variables involved in developing on any property. These variables include road and wetland setbacks, hillsides, flood plains, overlays, and most importantly the goals of the property owner who may choose not to fully develop their property as many owners have. These organizations, though well-intentioned, are taking a myopic perspective of this issue by asking that mechanisms be put in place so that we know exactly what development moves where and that all growth is met with dedicated conservation somewhere in the county. For example, if a mixed-use project is developed in town that contains more units than what is allowed under base zoning, the development rights of a corresponding number of lots in the County will be required to be extinguished in order to develop those units. As anyone involved in the Comp Plan understands, these mechanisms are very complicated and binding elected officials' and planners' hands with this kind of language will ensure that this Plan becomes the no growth Plan these organizations so readily seek. More importantly, other tools to limit development in the rural county will likely be more effective than requiring a direct linkage. Not only will a direct linkage stifle any desirable redevelopment in town, but it may preclude the exploration of more effective and community-wide efforts to preserve rural lands. 2) Development must pay its own way. As many of us professionals know, it does! Developments are required to pay sewer capacity fees, water tap fees and provide other infrastructure as necessary depending on the project type and location, and we know that landowners pay dearly for these types of mitigation. All of these fees are assessed by the Town or County based on the type of project and are intended to do exactly what is being requested. It's not necessary and it's too specific. The Comp Plan is a vision statement and should be viewed as such. Weighting it down with this type of detail is unnecessary and does not acknowledge that there are already many mitigation measures in place. If such measures need to be adjusted, or if new measures need to be added, then this discussion should occur when considering new regulations, not in a visionary document. 3) It's a downzone, be scared. The current Com Plan is not a downzone. Base property rights are 1 unit per 35 acres and this will not change under the current Plan. As elected officials and planners will tell you it is not legally possible to take away development rights. However, tools may not be allowed to be used in some areas such as a Planned Residential Development (PRD) or Non Contiguous Plan PRD. All tools are discretionary and can't be counted as a base property right. I encourage everyone to support elected officials and request that all current tools be kept as these tools have allowed for permanent conservation across our valley and will be important tools moving forward into the future. <p>It is my opinion that the community members behind these advertisements and ideas do not constitute a majority of the valley as they would have you believe. I personally have facilitated many public workshops where the vast majority of opinions expressed were incongruent with these organizations' stated intentions. Though they tend to be very vocal and well-funded, they nonetheless represent a minority view in our community, and talking louder shouldn't make their opinions any more valid than yours. I think everyone has the right to express their opinion, but I don't think it's fair to try and foist their self-serving "Statement of Intent" policy upon the community at the eleventh hour. I do encourage everyone to read the Comp Plan, talk to planners and elected officials and form your own opinions about the Plan based on the actual Plan. For the first time, I genuinely fear that this minority opinion will throw such a wrench into the process that the Comp Plan will continue indefinitely (after 5 years of preparation) and do our community a great disservice. As many are aware, many planning tools have been put on hold that are vital to continued redevelopment and revitalization in town along with improvements to town zoning districts such as the AR Cottage House, a policy which failed upon its third reading during Town Council because of the pending Comp Plan. There are many other examples like this where much-needed policy changes are not considered</p>

Date	Name	Comment
		<p>because of the prolonged Comprehensive Plan review, something that may benefit ivory-tower special interests, but do great disservice to the community at large. If this Plan continues to languish our community will continue to languish along with it. The next meeting for the Comp Plan is March 14th, where the Town Council and County Commission will begin the process of reviewing the current Plan with the goal of adopting the current Plan in May. I encourage everyone to take the time to provide comment to the Town Council and County Commission in support of the Plan. Though the deadline for written comment has passed, I believe it is worth your time to give verbal comment at the meeting. It may be an inconvenience now, but without your involvement, I fear our community will not be able to move forward.</p>
3/8/2012	Rosenberg, Vicki L. Interested Public	<p>You all have insisted that our community's top priority is to permanently protecting wildlife habitat. You have all insisted that you recognize how adding development potential to one area must be offset by permanent conservation elsewhere. Concerned citizens are merely asking for a simple accounting of how much development would be allowed in specific areas, something that none of you have been willing to publicly address. We need to know how much commercial development would take place under the proposed changes, and how much local citizens will be asked to contribute to such development in increased taxes or levies. We need to know if it's realistic to expect that we can house 65 percent of the county's workforce here; if not, commercial allocations should be reduced. All citizens, regardless on which side of this issue they stand, need to see a defined schedule that sets priorities and timelines for expected implementation of not only development plans, but also of conservation and wildlife protection efforts.</p>
		<p>Please read and carefully consider the Statement of Intent -- it doesn't ask for miracles... only for respect.</p>
3/8/2012	Warner, Bill, Kathy, & T Interested Public	<p>We are coming out! The developmentally disabled population of Jackson is looking for a place (residence) in our community - our hometown. We are especially interested in the new Comprehensive Plan Section 5: Local Workforce Housing. As part of our local workforce we wish to have the opportunity to own affordable housing (it is possible), rest and work here for the rest of our lives.</p> <p>Or requests/needs are atypical and not within the scope of this note. So, we would gladly meet with you or your representative to discuss our "special situation."</p> <p>I have included an attachment [below] showing our population again out of the School District over the next ten years.</p> <p>2012 - 3 adults 2013 - 3 adults 2014 - 0 adults 2015 - 2 adults 2016 - 4 adults 2017 - 1 adults 2018 - 4 adults 2019 - 2 adults 2020 - 5 adults 2021 - 3 adults</p>

Date	Name	Comment
3/7/2012	Fodor, Stefan Interested Public	<p>It was with great surprise that I read earlier this week, and again in today's weekly paper, that several "advocacy groups" are requesting that you add a statement of intent to the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>I urge you reject that request. The Comprehensive Plan review has taken the better part of five years and provided our community with numerous opportunities for written and oral public comment. Workshops have been held throughout the valley and the process has been shepherded along with consultants to be as inclusive as possible; all with the goal of having a comprehensive, well thought out planning document that represents what is best for the community, not any one special interest group. There are reams of public comment available online and the deadline for citizen input has passed. Why should one or several special interest groups get another chance to attempt to put their imprimatur on the plan?</p> <p>Is the latest draft of the Comprehensive Plan perfect? No. Do I agree with all of it? No. With a document affecting such a large cross section of Teton County, some people are inevitably going to be unhappy. However, I look at any collaborative process like being a cook. You can't please everybody.</p> <p>You have been elected by the public with a mandate to revise our comprehensive plan. Please don't delegate that privilege and authority to special interest lobbyists. Reject the "statement of intent".</p> <p>I thank you for your consideration of the above and the great lengths you have gone to in order to get the document to its final stages.</p>
3/2/2012	Stoker, Troy Interested Public	<p>I would like to express my thanks for your work on the Comprehensive Plan, specifically for voting to house 65% of the community's workforce locally. I am the Lift Director for Jackson Hole Mountain Resort. I oversee all of the maintenance for the lifts and the Tram at the mountain. This winter, as with every winter, I struggle with my workers who live on the other side of Teton Pass or down south in Star Valley. I am very thankful that a few of my workers have been fortunate enough to purchase an affordable home here in Teton County.</p> <p>This winter, when a big storm came in, Teton Pass was closed, and many of my workers were unable to make it to work. Of course, lots of snow means lots of skiers, and of course that was the moment when a couple of the lifts on the mountain began having problems and wouldn't start. If I had not had the guys who live locally, there would have been a long delay in opening.</p> <p>I have now resorted to purchasing hotel rooms for my workers when a storm is in the forecast because it is imperative that they make it to work to open the mountain and keep it running. However, this gets costly.</p> <p>I appreciate your support of Workforce Housing, and hope you will continue to find areas within the Character Districts to build more.</p>
3/1/2012	Howe, Rick Interested Public	<p>I had to leave to prepare for the NER Centennial Meeting. I just wanted to clarify what I may not have come across clearly as saying. For an elected official to put so much passion as you all do into something like the Comprehensive Plan update, my statement is simply please take the necessary steps to ensure there will be solid enforcement of those Policies that are adopted. It is an insult to your efforts, and the communities vision if what you adopt has no teeth, or the staff that will be willing to enforce it. I probably understand more than most about pre-platted parcels prior to any new adoptions, as referred to with Saddle Butte. I am referring to specifics where someone who may approach a new development, or even redevelopment and look at a 30-50 thousand dollar fine as chump change, vs following the development regulations in the first place (in other words I may chose the fine as an option to get what I want). This is not an attack on anyone wealthy, as I am happy for anyone who has accomplished success and wealth in their lifetime in order to live their dream. It is not worth going backwards, Bruce mentioned that things are working much better in current situations.</p> <p>Thank you for all of your valuable efforts,</p>
2/26/2012	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	<p>I have recently seen a "Statement of Intent" document that should be included in the new comprehensive plan.</p> <p>It is intelligent, simply states the goals of the valley, and brings to light the achievements that you and the community have been working on for the last four years. It should be added right after the acknowledgement page. (I searched but my name is not acknowledged)</p> <p>This is a no-brainer guys. As this "Statement of Intent" circulates in the valley and builds momentum you all are going to look like cross eyed dragons for not putting it in.</p> <p>What are you going to say? Gosh, I didn't understand it, or that is not our intent." Please.</p> <p>Take the high road boys (and girl) and let's get on with it.</p>

Date	Name	Comment
2/23/2012	Denny, Joshua Interested Public	I am writing to express my appreciation of and support for local workforce housing efforts such as that of the County Housing Authority. I have worked at the Jackson Hole Mtn. Resort year-round for over twelve years, and being able to purchase an affordable home on the Village Rd. two years ago allowed me to stay here in the Valley. The expense and hazard of a long commute likely would have driven me from the area. I hope local elected officials can continue to support this much needed option for workers who wish to remain in this beautiful area.
2/21/2012	Walker, Mark Interested Public	As a business owner here in Jackson I would like to thank you for your work on the Jackson-Teton County Comp plan. I know it has been a long process and I appreciate your time and efforts. The current plan keeps in mind the wishes of our community while allowing Jackson to continue to grow and prosper. We must balance our need to protect our wildlife and scenic landscapes with allowing our local economy to grow and businesses to thrive. I believe the comp plan accomplishes this.
2/20/2012	Hayek, Brady Interested Public	I ask that you stay the course and support the plan as it is written. Thank you for your work in laying out the new and improved Comp Plan for the valley.
2/19/2012	Wilbur, Janice Interested Public	As a business owner and resident, I feel it is a good fit for the valley, particularly, the critical balance between wildlife and the economy. I thank you for your time and would encourage you to approve the plan in it's current form.
2/16/2012	Brodie, Allison Interested Public	I want to thank you for all of your work on the Comp Plan, and in particular for supporting housing 65% of our work force locally. I am a retired university professor who has been living in Teton County for the past several years. I volunteer for several non-profits and government agencies and therefore personally find it difficult to attend your public meetings on this plan. I am writing to assure you that my lack of attendance is in no way an indication of any lack of support for housing our work force locally since I appreciate and understand how it enhances our community. Thank you for continuing to support housing 65% of our work force locally.
2/16/2012	Barlow, George Interested Public	Thank you for all your hard work on the Jackson-Teton County Comp plan. I know this has been a long and difficult process and that there were many volunteers. I had a great experience at one of your meetings and I'm happy with the hard work and decisions that have been made.
2/16/2012	Walker, Karen Interested Public	I'd like to commend you on the work that you've done with the Comp Plan. I believe it to be well balanced, on track, and most of all, fair. Thank you all of your hard work and diligence. It is time for all Teton County residents to support it. And for you to pass it. Congrats on a job well done.
2/15/2012	Dykes, George, M. Interested Public	I write today in support of the Jackson-Teton County Comp plan. As a mother and member of this community, I want Teton County to be a place where my children can come back to, be successful and raise their own children. I believe this plan will help us achieve this goal. The plan is very much representative of the views and wishes of the majority of us in the community. I hope you will support the plan as it is written and pass it in March. I would also like to thank you for time, hard work and commitment to seeing this plan through. I know this has been a long and difficult process and I very much appreciate all that you do for our community.
		My name is George Dykes and I've been a resident since January 2007. I'm writing to thank each of you for your hard work on the Jackson/Teton County comp plan. I'd also like to encourage you to pass the plan as is. I think the plan is balanced and fair and think you're on the right track.
		Thanks again for what you do

Date	Name	Comment
2/15/2012	Walker, Kristin Interested Public	<p>I would like to thank all of you for your continued efforts on the Jackson-Teton County Comp plan. I know how much time and effort you all have put into updating this plan and ensuring it meets the shared goals and values of the community. I believe the comp plan in its current state does just that. It is a fair, balanced and measured plan which will serve our community well for many years to come. I encourage you to support and pass the comp plan as is.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for all of your efforts.</p>
2/10/2012	Hawtin, Bruce Interested Public	<p>As far as all the issues you deal with, I guess the comprehensive plan floats to the top these days. Even though I have attended several sessions over the years and spoken to several of you personally, I have been very remiss in not being either more vocal or corresponding as often as I should have. I apologize for that.</p> <p>Overall I am very pleased with the process, although lengthy, and with what the final product will look like. At the joint planning meeting last night, I left early as I had heard most of the comments before and it seemed as though there are those that just have to be heard even though they repeat themselves. The usual players were there.</p> <p>On my way home I thought of two comments that I wish I had thought of at the meeting. Other than thanks for the many hours spent by the planning commissioners, I had thought it would have been interesting to poll the audience with two particular questions. One: How many people in the audience have employees? There were three that I could identify; Two: When you leave the meeting tonight, how many of you will have to drive over the hill into Idaho or down valley to Alpine or beyond to get home? I don't know how many hands would have gone up, but I suspect not many. I know you understand my line of questioning; being able to afford to live in Teton County and absolutely no need for workforce/employee housing.</p> <p>I have had literally hundreds of opportunities to discuss the planning process and those discussions have always been in support of the need for a comprehensive plan. We will have growth in Jackson Hole forever and I want that growth to be sustainable, managed, and controlled. I want the planning document to be firm, but fair and flexible. When I am told that our "Our property rights are being taken away!", and there is some conspiracy to undermine our rights by the UN, HUD and other federal and international agencies and groups, the answers are too numerous to share and my responses likewise. The bottom line is I am not intimidated by fear and when I feel there is something remiss, I have the freedom to take that concern to one of you knowing full well that something will be done. I may not always like the result but the point being, that my rights are not being ignored.</p> <p>When living in town I was asked years ago about running for the city council and now as a county resident, the same, and my answer has always been, "Thanks for asking, but no!". I can always give the time element as a reason, as so many do, but the more accurate reason is that if I could be allowed to make decisions only in those areas that I am comfortable with, I would do it, but you all have to wear far too many hats and I could never do that.</p> <p>I respect your willingness to serve this community in your capacities and I sincerely thank you for that.</p>
2/8/2012	Duncker, Paul Interested Public	<p>I would like to echo previous Commissioners' acknowledgement of Staff and the outstanding job you've all done I think throughout this process. This is the third version of this update that we've worked on and each one has been better than the last and all three of them were better than the Plan we have in place now, so I'm generally very happy with the direction it's all gone. I'll make one comment to the public in general. In the context of this Plan, there's been a lot of public comment about additive growth. And in the context of this Plan the words permanent conservation and additive growth are almost synonymous. Additive growth is only a byproduct of permanent conservation, so it's not something that we should be afraid of, it's something we should be embracing, because any additive growth means that somewhere else there's some permanent conservation, and that's our number-one priority. So, I'm...overall, I wish...the only way I think this Plan could have been better—it's the best we're ever going to get and it's a consensus-based Plan—I wish we could have done a little bit more for the large historic landowners who have been such great stewards of our Valley up until now. But they still have the options they had in the last Plan and the door is not shut on developing new ones yet, so I'm optimistic.</p>

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Vanillin, Anthony Interested Public	<p>Hi, my name is Anthony Vanillin. First, I want to thank you guys for your public service. Lord knows I don't have the time or probably want to take on the task that you guys take on. The previous gentleman here had quite a bit of stuff that I wanted to ask you guys about as much as is supposed to be commentary. I do have one or two questions to whit. One, the Plan that you guys vote on tonight, is that set in stone? I would like to see it be...that's my big problem with this. If you guys vote on a Plan and say, here's the Plan, we're going to do this, and then six months down the road, we have somebody else come in, well, we'll just move it over here a little bit and then move it over here a little bit and then we'll add this and add this and nobody else gets to comment on it, what's the point of all this? Maybe you guys don't see what I'm trying to drive at. It scares me that you guys would put together a wonderful Plan, however you may change it, and then just be able to change it later on without the public saying, yes, we want it changed this way and this way without going through this whole process again. And then the second thing is my problem with the Housing Authority. How much authority does the Housing Authority have in this Plan? And then how do we, as taxpayers, hold them accountable? Or how do we hold you accountable to hold them accountable? Because they're not elected people, am I correct on that? They're appointed? You guys appoint them? So, who of you guys oversees them that we can say, okay, you're the person or you're the person that holds the Housing Authority accountable? Who do we come after to get changes? With that, I know, you guys, it's supposed to be commentary and you can't really answer questions, but a couple of points that need to be brought up. Thank you.</p>
2/8/2012	Buchwald, Dana Interested Public	Okay, I just wanted to thank the public and Town and County Staff and fellow Commissioners for all their effort and ideas. And that's it.
1/26/2012	Frederick, Bud Interested Public	It seems the cart is in front of the horse...I urge you to work to rescind the current school district ban while the legal issues and a new plan are under way.
1/20/2012	LaJeunesse, Debbie Teton County Housing	<p>The Teton County Housing Authority (TCHA) Board would like to recognize and commend you for the work you have done on the Comprehensive Plan. We applaud you for making it a truly public process, and incorporating the passion expressed by the community to craft a plan that works to preserve our values.</p> <p>In particular, the goal of housing 65% of our workforce locally will help ensure stability and vibrancy for this community. The TCHA Board looks forward to helping you implement the many policies articulated in the document as they relate to housing our workforce.</p> <p>The TCHA Board is grateful for the hard work that both Town and County Staff, Planning Commissions, and Elected Officials put into making the approved Comprehensive Plan a successful plan for the future of this valley.</p> <p>Thank you for your service and commitment to this community!</p>

1: Town Square

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Varley, Jay Interested Public	<p>My name's Jay Varley. I own property <<inaudible>>. I'd like to talk a little bit about Town as Heart, which was in the last Plan, and also about downtown as, let's say, heart of the heart, because I think that the density of the downtown area ought to be convenient to alternative modes of transportation. And actually the biggest one of that is walking. And so I think that we need to try to concentrate that development close to the center of Town. And when I talk about walking, you have to consider topography, too, because when there's some big elevation being like there is from down the Highway coming up, that discourages walking, too, so people won't walk as far. It also makes the bus transportation to be more effective as well. And that bus transportation also takes people to the supermarkets and other places that you ?? that you have downtown. So I'd like to encourage that. And I'd like to discourage too much development...to consider the Highway too much as the appropriate places for development. And it does encourage sprawl; it encourages people to drive to these places. I'm not saying you can just freeze the whole thing, but don't be highway oriented. That's just a typical American suburban type of development, so it needs to be more concentrated ?? . And hopefully the areas that are not really on the Square, that they can develop as mixed-use and put people living there. And also in a way we can start getting the kinds of businesses, once there's enough critical mass in that area, to serve those people and we can have the kind of businesses that would attract the whole community at various times, as well as people living down there. I'm really looking more for a kind of a European village-type model. Usually very pedestrian oriented and relatively hard lines when you get out of it. That's my vision as to what I'd like to see. And I think there's a lot of advantages to it, you avoid sprawl, and it just is a more sensible way to live, and I think that's the way it's going to occur in the future anyway, like Town, of course. Oh, I'd also caution another thing, too. It's when the area gets too big, we take a risk of having development on the fringes where often the land is larger parcels, easier to develop, and we could end up with gaps between that...big gaps between that and the core downtown, which are like dead zones and people don't really want to walk through. It needs to be interesting through the whole thing for people to want to walk to it. So that's one of the hazards of getting too far out of the core with big developments. Thank you.</p>
1/26/2012	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	<p>Hello, Gail Jensen. I'm also a member of the Teton Village Road Coalition. And we grouped up because we feel...we all are feeling the same thing—it's called the urbanization of Jackson Hole. I moved here, and most of us moved here, because we wanted a rural lifestyle. That's why we moved here, and that's what we want, and that's why people come here. It is not the intense dense development of the resource. I really am appalled that that looks like the direction we're headed. Town, the up zoning in Town is immense. I have always ?? in Town, Town Square, right off of Town Square on Center Street, and I am pleased that you have taken a step back for the two-story around Town Square, but immediately behind that is three and possibly even more stories. And if you add up all those areas that you ?? your Town Plan, it's immense growth, and it doesn't relate to what the residential densities can be in Town. So, I take a different look at it. Where are you going to put all the employees and all the people that are going to have to work in those commercial areas. But you're going to have to have the nodes outside in the County to house them. So, I look at it in the opposite direction, and a couple of other people have spoken about. But my main problem is is the urbanization of Jackson Hole. It's not what I want. It's not what a lot of people in the community wants. And I really think you need to take a step back and follow what the community wants. It's, you know, it's our souls, we're selling our souls. Are we selling it for the dollars? I don't see the dollars coming into the community with this growth. I don't know where the motivation really is. I don't know where it's coming from, because it's certainly not coming from the community at large. Please, please reconsider...please. Thank you.</p>

1: Town Square

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Jorgensen, Pete Interested Public	<p>I'm sorry, Pete Jorgensen and I live in Town. First, I've been involved in planning here since the '50s, having served as the local coordinator for the RUDAT study focused on South Park. Very simple and very straight forward; none of the recommendations in here were involved. I'd like to comment first on the fact that I don't know as much as you folks do <<inaudible>>. But I do appreciate these opportunities to make comments. I submitted written comments a couple of years ago, which I tried to review at your last public comment meeting ??, so I will keep this very short. And any comments I make tonight should not be taken personally, certainly not by these boards; the County Commissioners, that's another thing. I saw the first diagram you put up and it reminded me of something I saw in previous business, not here, somewhere else. The company I was working for did projects in Vietnam and somebody got and they drew three overriding circles or interlocking circles and tried to explain it that way. And, I'm sorry, I'm probably getting more dense as I get older, but I just don't understand where this is going, when the County has made such a commitment to open space, wildlife preservation, 97 percent federal land, which we hope is protected, conservation easements over 10,000, and I don't know exactly how many. I was a member of the three families who did the first nature conservancies in Wyoming at Skyline Ranch, four hundred dollars and 600 acres permanently preserved. I don't think we got anything out of it; we didn't have enough income to take a tax credit. But that's the history of this Valley. And I guess I don't want to say we shouldn't grow, but I will say the County shouldn't grow. We should split the County and the Town apart for purposes of long-range planning. The Town as Heart makes a lot of sense, but when you look at the implications of growth anywhere, and ultimately that's what happens right through the Village, it's easy to understand why WYDOT says, you've got to have the three lanes or five lanes. They project traffic 20 years in the future. Every projection that has been made in this County has been met or exceeded. There's no effort, no meaningful, serious effort by the planning entities, and again it's not you folks—it's the County Commissioners who have that authority to limit growth or control what happens. They were spending 80 percent on construction that was federal money; they have requirements that it meet certain standards. That's their job. They will do their job eventually. The second thing...and the third thing is the districts. And that's...15 districts is fine but the ones that make up the Town, Town as Heart are the important ones to consider more density. I don't know whether it should be there or not. We'll talk about that when you get to that point. But I urge you to try and take care of the County lands. Things Peter spoke to, there are not many properties left that have not been developed that would lend themselves to a large development where you would actually gain a conservation easement in exchange for density. So I would urge you to look carefully at the map and see what you're really talking about. You're clearly talking about the north end of South Park. That's been kicked down the road for 20 years, 30 years. And I'm not sure waiting for infill in Town is doing anything more than just delaying some definitive action that shows some limits. The timeline is another thing I would like to see, and I keep thinking these meetings are a chance that somebody is going to say that this is the deal and recommend it and the elected officials adopt it. But so far I don't have a sense of where we're going and when we're going to get there and I'd really like to have that. Thank you very much.</p>
1/24/2012	,	<p>How will the definition of "Western character" be determined? As a committee we are concerned about the standards with which a regulation to commit to a western character will be identified.</p> <p>Is there the possibility to include a limited amount of residential, mixed use in this model as exemplified by Davies Reid? This will make the Town Square more vital to our community and more regularly occupied with amenities that support a neighborhood.</p>

2: Town Commercial Core

Date	Name	Comment
3/1/2012	Wallace, Jim Interested Public	<p>Thank you for your dedication and service to our Community; and for reading this comment.</p> <p>RE: Willow Street Corridor</p> <p>The Willow Street Corridor Certified Character District designation, as District 2, Subarea 2.7, is absolutely appropriate and visionary. This designation reflects keen subjective study; an acute understanding of Community Character; considers movement by all transportation modes; envisions the "Complete Neighborhood's" needs & wishes; promotes an attractive& welcoming visual appearance; cleanly enhances local commerce and our tourism economy, and promotes general welfare and over-all human & wildlife safety.</p> <p>Well done! Thank you,</p>
2/8/2012	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	<p>Hi, Becky Tillson, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. This has been the mark of the end of your years and years of involvement. I really just wanted to thank you. I know not all of you have been involved since the beginning, but it's been a massive effort and you've been really responsive to the community and I just wanted to thank you for that. We are ?? Resolution and we're generally supportive of the direction you're giving to the electeds, but I have a couple of additional suggestions to add tonight. First, the issue of infrastructure costs, the idea of development paying its own way, was not really covered last time due to time constraints. We hope that you'll revisit that today. Our commitment to growth paying its way should be included in the introduction to the maps, and we'd just appreciate a little bit of conversation about that. Also from last time, the conversation that was called down zoning, which wasn't really an accurate representation I don't think of what the public was asking for, but that was also cut off due to time. In our view, this issues ties into the permanency of open space projection, as well as the idea of producing the overall development potential countywide, and some direction from you guys with regard to that issue would also be much appreciated. Also I'm hoping you will consider adding a statement at the beginning of the maps that clearly establishes the prioritization of wildlife and natural resources. And I know Tyler mentioned that in his presentation, but a real clear statement in there not only that ?? being balanced with the other community goals but that that's the priority. I think there's just a little bit different wording that could clarify that. Specific to the districts, looking at District 4.5, which is Karns Meadow. Again, this has to do with balancing. It would be nice if you could clarify that wildlife needs will be prioritized over recreational needs in this sensitive location. A balance right now...it says it will be balanced. I think it's fair to say they should be prioritized. In District 5.6, I'm just curious as to where the reference to mixed-use development came from, and I didn't really hear that in your conversation and maybe if you could clarify your intentions around that, that would be helpful. Also in District 5.6, I think we need to clarify the language to say that the desired development pattern is not Town-level density, but rather closer to what the existing neighborhoods around there have, so that we don't get something that's super, super dense right there. We support the move to keep the Aspens, 12.2 District, stable, not transitional. As you know, it's already an overburdened road that has significant wildlife value in the area, so we support that. Lastly, in Districts 2, 3, 4, 5, and 13, those district descriptions would benefit from additional language reaffirming the importance of wildlife permeability. Again, kind of the central goal of this Plan. This is really something that Commissioner Newcomb had mentioned last time that also kind of got cut off due to time, but many areas in our community, even in Town, are either within or adjacent to wildlife habitat and public land, but there's not a butte in a riparian area for just kind of as open space. It all provides important wildlife habitat, and development does impact that, so if we could mention wildlife permeability in development of those districts, that would be helpful. A lot of the other districts already mention it but these ones didn't. Thank you again for all of your work on this. We look forward to seeing how these changes are incorporated and I thank you very much for your service.</p>

2: Town Commercial Core

Date	Name	Comment
2/1/2012	Sibson, Barry Interested Public	<p>After four years of participation in the Comprehensive Plan process, I was quite pleased with the "Character District" plan for South Park. The key aspect of the SP plan was the preservation of the current open space. I am concerned, however, about the type of development and added population in the Northwest corner of the area and the concept of new roads connecting Melody Ranch, Rafter J and South Park Ranches.</p> <p>With the change of direction for the "Pines/Aspens" district, I am very concerned that there might be some thoughts of change in the South Park district. I believe that if any additional development were inserted in the SP district that it would be very detrimental to the South Park community, to wildlife movement and to the visual aspects of the approach to town.</p> <p>Important to me are:</p> <p>The open space in SP being permanently preserved, not just a zoning issue that could be changed in the future. Any development in SP should be tied contactually to preservation of open space in SP.</p> <p>A corridor for wildlife movement down the west side of SP. I live next to Bob Lucas's ranch and have frequently seen and heard elk migrating through his ranch. I believe that they come down through the Sherr Thoss property and not down Flat Creek.</p> <p>Maintenance of the rural view across SP from South 89 to the western mountains.</p> <p>Incentives for the SP ranchers to continue ranching.</p> <p>No additive development rights to those already existing.</p> <p>A decrease in allowable commercial development.</p> <p>Maintenance of a walkable town with a human scale to all development. Too many of the already developed 3 story buildings in town do not have that scale and are overwhelming. A step back of the third story should be required.</p> <p>I appreciate the fact that the proposed plan has been scaled down to be more in keeping with the desires of the community, but I DO NOT want South Park to become the default area for growth.</p>

2: Town Commercial Core

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Varley, Jay Interested Public	<p>My name's Jay Varley. I own property <<inaudible>>. I'd like to talk a little bit about Town as Heart, which was in the last Plan, and also about downtown as, let's say, heart of the heart, because I think that the density of the downtown area ought to be convenient to alternative modes of transportation. And actually the biggest one of that is walking. And so I think that we need to try to concentrate that development close to the center of Town. And when I talk about walking, you have to consider topography, too, because when there's some big elevation being like there is from down the Highway coming up, that discourages walking, too, so people won't walk as far. It also makes the bus transportation to be more effective as well. And that bus transportation also takes people to the supermarkets and other places that you ?? that you have downtown. So I'd like to encourage that. And I'd like to discourage too much development...to consider the Highway too much as the appropriate places for development. And it does encourage sprawl; it encourages people to drive to these places. I'm not saying you can just freeze the whole thing, but don't be highway oriented. That's just a typical American suburban type of development, so it needs to be more concentrated ?? . And hopefully the areas that are not really on the Square, that they can develop as mixed-use and put people living there. And also in a way we can start getting the kinds of businesses, once there's enough critical mass in that area, to serve those people and we can have the kind of businesses that would attract the whole community at various times, as well as people living down there. I'm really looking more for a kind of a European village-type model. Usually very pedestrian oriented and relatively hard lines when you get out of it. That's my vision as to what I'd like to see. And I think there's a lot of advantages to it, you avoid sprawl, and it just is a more sensible way to live, and I think that's the way it's going to occur in the future anyway, like Town, of course. Oh, I'd also caution another thing, too. It's when the area gets too big, we take a risk of having development on the fringes where often the land is larger parcels, easier to develop, and we could end up with gaps between that...big gaps between that and the core downtown, which are like dead zones and people don't really want to walk through. It needs to be interesting through the whole thing for people to want to walk to it. So that's one of the hazards of getting too far out of the core with big developments. Thank you.</p>
1/26/2012	Jorgensen, Pete Interested Public	<p>I'm sorry, Pete Jorgensen and I live in Town. First, I've been involved in planning here since the '50s, having served as the local coordinator for the RUDAT study focused on South Park. Very simple and very straight forward; none of the recommendations in here were involved. I'd like to comment first on the fact that I don't know as much as you folks do <<inaudible>>. But I do appreciate these opportunities to make comments. I submitted written comments a couple of years ago, which I tried to review at your last public comment meeting ??, so I will keep this very short. And any comments I make tonight should not be taken personally, certainly not by these boards; the County Commissioners, that's another thing. I saw the first diagram you put up and it reminded me of something I saw in previous business, not here, somewhere else. The company I was working for did projects in Vietnam and somebody got and they drew three overriding circles or interlocking circles and tried to explain it that way. And, I'm sorry, I'm probably getting more dense as I get older, but I just don't understand where this is going, when the County has made such a commitment to open space, wildlife preservation, 97 percent federal land, which we hope is protected, conservation easements over 10,000, and I don't know exactly how many. I was a member of the three families who did the first nature conservancies in Wyoming at Skyline Ranch, four hundred dollars and 600 acres permanently preserved. I don't think we got anything out of it; we didn't have enough income to take a tax credit. But that's the history of this Valley. And I guess I don't want to say we shouldn't grow, but I will say the County shouldn't grow. We should split the County and the Town apart for purposes of long-range planning. The Town as Heart makes a lot of sense, but when you look at the implications of growth anywhere, and ultimately that's what happens right through the Village, it's easy to understand why WYDOT says, you've got to have the three lanes or five lanes. They project traffic 20 years in the future. Every projection that has been made in this County has been met or exceeded. There's no effort, no meaningful, serious effort by the planning entities, and again it's not you folks—it's the County Commissioners who have that authority to limit growth or control what happens. They were spending 80 percent on construction that was federal money; they have requirements that it meet certain standards. That's their job. They will do their job eventually. The second thing...and the third thing is the districts. And that's...15 districts is fine but the ones that make up the Town, Town as Heart are the important ones to consider more density. I don't know whether it should be there or not. We'll talk about that when you get to that point. But I urge you to try and take care of the County lands. Things Peter spoke to, there are not many properties left that have not been developed that would lend themselves to a large development where you would actually gain a conservation easement in exchange for density. So I would urge you to look carefully at the map and see what you're really talking about. You're clearly talking about the north end of South Park. That's been kicked down the road for 20 years, 30 years. And I'm not sure waiting for infill in Town is doing anything more than just delaying some definitive action that shows some limits. The timeline is another thing I would like to see, and I keep thinking these meetings are a chance that somebody is going to say that this is the deal and recommend it and the elected officials adopt it. But so far I don't have a sense of where we're going and when we're going to get there and I'd really like to have that. Thank you very much.</p>

2: Town Commercial Core

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	<p>Hi, I'm Becky Tillson, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. I wanted to start by thanking all of you guys for the enormous amount of time you've served the last couple of years. <<inaudible>>. So, thank you for all of that. Trevor covered earlier some of our most comprehensive ???. Those are also included in our written comments. I wanted to give just a couple of specific suggestions about the maps, district map on the ?? section. Overall, in the introduction, there needs to be a statement that clearly establishes the prioritization of wildlife and natural resources, which in this Plan is the well-documented will of the community. As we did for Buffalo Valley, it should be clear that choosing a goal of housing or workforce or whatever should not trump the top priority of wildlife protection. Also, in the introduction, the definition of conservation area should be clarified that we will not only be reducing impacts of development but actually the overall development potential in the area as well. And lastly—I think Greg mentioned this earlier—there needs to be a clear consideration of commercial development potential throughout the County ?? the need for housing and the amount and type of commercial development that works with ?? districts. Specific to the districts, there's just a couple of other things. In Districts #2 and 4, I think it would be important to clarify that Flat Creek enhancements are not only social but also <<inaudible>>. In District 2, we do agree that <<inaudible>>, but I just wanted to point out right now that we don't believe it's appropriate for the ?? to extend into District 4 unless it's really explicitly limited to existing nonconforming uses. District 5, <<inaudible>>. I think...I just wanted to make it clear that the idea is not to give an up zone in Northern South Park without first trying to do it elsewhere. It is a good idea to continue the discussion on linking development in this area to the growth management plan, and perhaps a solution maybe is to have linkage to the growth management plan include the caveat allowing for development that's associated with permanent open space protection ???. In District 6, I think I mentioned that it would be important to clarify that further subdivision should not be encouraged. District...the River Bottom District mentions ?? and I think that should be included in the Town and County Periphery districts as well. In #10, the wildlife corridors that was mentioned, that Rich was talking about, east/west, are important to point out. High-density development in the Aspens, which is an area with high wildlife values and existing road kill problems and transportation problems, as you all know, is not consistent with the goals of this Plan...high-density development in the Aspens is not consistent with the goals of the Plan. We don't know exactly how ?? is slated for that area, but it makes sense to really minimize that ???. In the Village, this new change that we've been talking about, about not increasing beyond the established footprint, we think it's a good idea, but we prefer to see the amount and type of that future growth. ?? development that will generate markets rather than ?? is really inappropriate. The balance of convenience commercial and workforce residential housing could be explored but only with some analysis of the <<inaudible>>. As we change the subdistrict lines, people should be able to maintain the rural character of that gateway area, preserving the rural character ?? really explicit having a change around the lines there. That's too much and I just wanted to thank you guys again for your years of service and ???. Thank you.</p>
1/26/2012	Genzer, Jim Interested Public	<p>I'm Jim Genzer; I've lived in the community for 40 years, 38 of that right next door on Snow King Drive. And I would like, first of all, to say Patty Ewing's comments for Southeast Jackson is very appropriate to keep it as single-family housing. I think our numbers are very, very unrealistic, as Bill has mentioned. Doubling the size of the number of residences in the community is absolutely wrong. The double the size of commercial is absolutely wrong. Increasing areas like the Aspens and the Village by little pieces and then turn around and dumping the rest of the growth in the Town of Jackson is absolutely wrong. That is not the way things should happen. We...in the Town, the core commercial and resort areas to be expanded out to the...it used to be the Y, now the X, is a silly, silly thing. It will eliminate the western flavor, the western atmosphere that we have had for generations in Jackson Hole. That is not what we should be doing. If we want to be in step with a western community and the rest of the State of Wyoming, we will not do that kind of development. Can you imagine driving from the Y into Town with three-, four-story buildings in a dead zone? The only thing you can see is the antennas on top of Snow King. We're no different than any other city USA. If we want to keep the character of Jackson Hole, we do not allow the Town of Jackson to become the dumping ground for the community. None of this three-, four-story housing. We keep the character that we have right now. I think that, in order to do that, we have to eliminate the idea of having 65 percent of our employees housed in Teton County. That will not work. If we expect growth, 65 percent is wrong, and at a maximum, I would say 45 percent of employees that live in Teton County. And I thank you for the time that you have taken to listen to us and I really hope it engenders some revisions and attitude changes within our County and Town officials. Thank you.</p>

2: Town Commercial Core

Date	Name	Comment
1/24/2012 ,	Design Review Committ	<p>2.3 Downtown: The vision of this district is strong and appropriate, and the integration of lodging with residential uses is a very good objective that would boost town's vitality. Completing the strong link between Snow King, the Center for the Arts and Town Square is an important priority. Projects should be supported that add to the vitality of this linkage. A concern to be noted is the proposed expansion of the Lodging Overlay to the 5-way. We hear a lot of complaints at DRC meetings from lodging owners about the hardships of having hotel rooms next to busy roads - thus leading oftentimes to very non-urban proposals. The parking requirements also make this an additional challenge. We would like to avoid seeing suburban development patterns in this area.</p> <p>2.5 North Cache Gateway: The character of a 'key gateway' needs to be more precisely determined and explained in a manner that stresses the equality of importance to that of the Flat Creek redevelopment. It may need to be a more comprehensive description than "should take the form of 2/3 story buildings that address the North Cache and Flat Creek corridor."</p>
1/9/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	<p>If Save Historic Jackson Hole were allowed to participate in the "Red Dot" exercise this week, the attached list is where we would place our dots. After each dot is a brief explanation of why we would place our dots there.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan must include building and density numbers. o A Plan without metrics isn't a real plan. • Any density increase must be balanced with density decrease. o Permanent Protection of sensitive areas was and is the objective, not town growth. o Protection of sensitive areas is what was sold to the public and the promise needs to be kept. • No Zoning changes and density transfer until a mechanism is in place. o With 50-70 years of growth already in the pipeline, we have time to get this right. • Protect rural character and small town atmosphere everywhere. o Jackson Hole is all about small town rural character; that's what we are. o The current draft only extends this protection to the Town Square. • Eliminate contradictory and confusing definitions. o We can provide a list, but start with "stable" and "complete neighborhoods." • Do not encourage development in Northern South Park. o Infill in Town before we sprawl south. o We do not want to refight the Porter Annexation battle. • Do not expand the Lodging Overlay. o The existing overlay already allows for more lodging, where's the need to make it larger? We are rarely at full occupancy now. • No Density increase in difficult/sensitive areas. <p>The following areas all have access problems and are adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. They should not see increases in density.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Between Broadway and Flat Creek in Midtown and Town Commercial Core. o Steep hillsides at the "Y" o Commercial development at the Aspens should not expand across 390.

2: Town Commercial Core

Date	Name	Comment
1/23/2010	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	After attending almost all of the Comp Plan meetings and workshops over the last 4 years, myself and many other community members have come to the same conclusion: take the 1994 plan and improve and tweak it to better reflect the need to protect wildlife habitat and connectivity, keep our small town character, plan for the future already entitled growth, keep visitors coming to Jackson Hole and try to do all this in a manner that respects the environment. The Vision – Themes and Policies part of the document does an adequate job of outlining many of tweaks to the 1994 policies. The missing piece that is not clearly stated is the plan of how infrastructure improvements necessary to implement the policies will be undertaken. The updating of and expansion of infrastructure just to accommodate entitled but not yet built development is a major concern. Accurately analyzing infrastructure and their costs need to be presented to the community before policies or maps are approved. Commitments to supply infrastructure to already entitled development plus up-zonings whether located in town or the county could bankrupt our community.

Please consider the following comments specific to the Character District Chapters:

- The County

The Character District maps are vague purposefully to allow a vast amount of additive growth in a number of Districts. Too many uncertainties exist which include what will be next door, how dense, how tall, what will this do to wildlife, roads, traffic, what will it cost. The additive growth that the Character District maps show does not retain the character of Rural Jackson Hole but creates urban nodes of high densities that the community has consistently rejected. Limiting growth to infill development following existing zoning and character throughout Teton County respects existing property rights and retains what we all love about Jackson Hole. We all know and accept these numbers and feel that this is the maximum build out that can be supported. Why not keep the Character District Chapters but eliminate all additive growth? Why not adjust all incentive based tools (PRD) to attain the goals identified in the Vision (Themes and Policies) for minimizing rural and greenfield development to better protect wildlife, open spaces, yet still respect property rights? Why not make the PRD more of an individual "CUP type process"? A letter dated 1/9/2012 from the Jackson Hole Land Trust states "These incentives should be both strong and diverse, as what works for one landowner in a key habitat may not for his or her neighbor."

The concept of feathering out density to and from drastic hard line changes in density should be a consistent policy throughout all town and county districts. This has been left out of numerous districts in both town and county. One particular example is the southern area of district 12.4 where a hard line of 10 units per acre (JH Campground) back up to now a hard fast suggested change for a policy of 1 unit per acre. The specific Neighborhood Form illustration is not accurate. A general policy of minimum lot size for the area with density feathering allowances would be more appropriate for the area.

Districts along Teton Village Road.

A letter dated 6/11/2009 sent to Teton County Planning and Development from Grand Teton National Park Superintendent, Mary Gibson Scott states "Accurate build out forecasts are important to understanding future development impacts and are needed to ensure protection of wildlife, natural, and scenic resources." "Development on the west side of the Snake River along the Wyoming 390 corridor (Teton Village, Aspens and Wilson development nodes) is of particular importance because of the potential to adversely affect a portion of the Moose-Wilson Road within the park as well as important wildlife habitat and movement corridors." "Future growth on the Wyoming 390 corridor, as well as transportation-related actions, may significantly affect the park and should be carefully considered."

Review of Appendix K (page 8-54) in the Vision document anticipates a Level of Service for Highway 390 to drop from high LOS E(1996) to a High F(possibly already by 2012 as no reconstruction has occurred as was anticipated by 2004). Additional growth beyond what was planned in 1994 will further degrade the LOS below the report used in Appendix K. Any additive growth on Hwy 390 without improvements to a LOS of at least D as required by County standards is irresponsible planning.

- Town of Jackson

2: Town Commercial Core

Date	Name	Comment
		<p>It is very clear that the Town of Jackson has a big growth agenda. I do not see much resistance from town residents. There is no effort to relate the amount of non-residential growth potential to what the resultant residential workforce housing needs will be based on the Character districts. Infrastructure improvements capabilities and costs must be analyzed. Will Town establish a new tax (property or sales) to pay for the massive additional and upgraded infrastructure needed for this expansion?</p>
		<p>Again feathering changes in density from one district or even within districts is a very important policy especially with the amount of growth that town is proposing. The area of Karns Meadow and surrounding properties appears to be trying to be too many things for many non-compatible uses. Is this area to be more for a wildlife corridor or a developed city type park? Is the park to be focal point for intense commercial buildings surrounding the park? How Does the Start facility fit into all of this? I hope the choice to develop Karns Meadow into a low key more interpretive park with minimal development except a pathway is more of the approved direction.</p>

Thank You for considering my comments at both the planning commission level and the commissioner/mayor/town council level.

3: Town Residential Core

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	<p>Hi, Becky Tillson, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. This has been the mark of the end of your years and years of involvement. I really just wanted to thank you. I know not all of you have been involved since the beginning, but it's been a massive effort and you've been really responsive to the community and I just wanted to thank you for that. We are ?? Resolution and we're generally supportive of the direction you're giving to the electeds, but I have a couple of additional suggestions to add tonight. First, the issue of infrastructure costs, the idea of development paying its own way, was not really covered last time due to time constraints. We hope that you'll revisit that today. Our commitment to growth paying its way should be included in the introduction to the maps, and we'd just appreciate a little bit of conversation about that. Also from last time, the conversation that was called down zoning, which wasn't really an accurate representation I don't think of what the public was asking for, but that was also cut off due to time. In our view, this issues ties into the permanency of open space projection, as well as the idea of producing the overall development potential countywide, and some direction from you guys with regard to that issue would also be much appreciated. Also I'm hoping you will consider adding a statement at the beginning of the maps that clearly establishes the prioritization of wildlife and natural resources. And I know Tyler mentioned that in his presentation, but a real clear statement in there not only that ?? being balanced with the other community goals but that that's the priority. I think there's just a little bit different wording that could clarify that. Specific to the districts, looking at District 4.5, which is Karns Meadow. Again, this has to do with balancing. It would be nice if you could clarify that wildlife needs will be prioritized over recreational needs in this sensitive location. A balance right now...it says it will be balanced. I think it's fair to say they should be prioritized. In District 5.6, I'm just curious as to where the reference to mixed-use development came from, and I didn't really hear that in your conversation and maybe if you could clarify your intentions around that, that would be helpful. Also in District 5.6, I think we need to clarify the language to say that the desired development pattern is not Town-level density, but rather closer to what the existing neighborhoods around there have, so that we don't get something that's super, super dense right there. We support the move to keep the Aspens, 12.2 District, stable, not transitional. As you know, it's already an overburdened road that has significant wildlife value in the area, so we support that. Lastly, in Districts 2, 3, 4, 5, and 13, those district descriptions would benefit from additional language reaffirming the importance of wildlife permeability. Again, kind of the central goal of this Plan. This is really something that Commissioner Newcomb had mentioned last time that also kind of got cut off due to time, but many areas in our community, even in Town, are either within or adjacent to wildlife habitat and public land, but there's not a butte in a riparian area for just kind of as open space. It all provides important wildlife habitat, and development does impact that, so if we could mention wildlife permeability in development of those districts, that would be helpful. A lot of the other districts already mention it but these ones didn't. Thank you again for all of your work on this. We look forward to seeing how these changes are incorporated and I thank you very much for your service.</p>
2/8/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	<p>Armond Acri, representing Save Historic Jackson Hole. We'd like to thank you guys for your efforts; I know you guys put a lot of time into it and we're close to the end. Thanks for what you've done. I'll focus my comments on items that were discussed last meeting where we feel we've gone off track. Area 3.2, District 3.2, Core District, public opinion favors two stories and you've gone to three, really question where that came from. Area 4.1, once again, public opinion, 70 to 80 percent favors three stories. This is all from the surveys that started back...and then I heard repeatedly during the open house meetings, and so again I think you've strayed off of what the public has asked you to do there. Five point six, redundant streets, grids and alleys, and mixed-use are not compatible with the adjoining neighborhoods. There's no alleys, I don't believe, west of Millward, so I'm not sure why all of a sudden we're going to jump to alleys in that area. That seems like again a ???. And the real question there is why is there so much detail on this when everything else was supposed to be at a higher level? This isn't supposed to be a Master Plan. I would suggest you go back to the previous statement, which was that it be compatible with the adjoining neighborhoods. That's a good statement, and when the time comes to develop it, then we can address the detail issue there. Teton Village, we would suggest that you not just limit them to footprint but also put in a statement that any increase in residential must come out of the Master Plan, as Commissioner Schwartz pointed out before. There is a Master Plan that's also binding, and so just to increase the density there would be a violation of that Master Plan. So, we ask you to go ahead and certify this and pass this along with the comment that you've heard the public has concerns about the issues that are not all resolved in the character districts, such as timing of the zoning discussions and decisions, and ask that the electeds resolve that at the next level. Thank you. Keep up the good work.</p>

3: Town Residential Core

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	<p>Sorry, I'll be less windy...Peter Moyer from the Village Road area. Just starting at the north on the character districts—and I'm only speaking for myself—Teton Village, instead of dumping more residential density up there, it would make sense to me...what they've missed up there is having a real Village. And frankly I would love to see more really appropriate commercial zoning, so you don't just have hotbeds up there dumping into other parts of the Valley. I think it makes it a much more quality experience up there, plus in some ways it takes pressure off the roads if you do it right. So, that's one thing. The Aspens, I won't repeat, we've been through all that. I really appreciate, and I think a lot of people really appreciate, your decision when it was time for stability, which is what so many of these neighborhoods want to encourage. Wilson, it's the same thing, you know. You look at Wilson and the Aspens and in terms of creating a lot of new up-zone density in areas that are about 12 to 15 feet beneath the bed of the Snake River right on the Teton Fall just never made a whole lot of sense to a lot of us. I mean, those of us who are there, yes, it's a risk you accept, but in terms of future up-zone density for Wilson, the Aspens area just never made sense. Teton Village is much higher, it's not a problem, even though it's on the Fall. Moving down to other parts of Town, South Park, the Town, to me the key thing is sort of honoring as best you can the sort of wishes and desires of the people in those neighborhoods, so you're not just dumping density from on high from the Ivory Tower where it's really doing it right and making it comfortable for them. You look at what's gone on here and we have a pretty severe recession. What people love is stability. In hard times like this, stability is really important. So, sort of zapping neighborhoods with sort of up zoning decrees coming from on high, I just don't think it's proper at this time, plus the free market actually has been working great along those lines. There's less of a demand on the workforce, we've lost thousands of jobs, plus prices in a free market have come down dramatically. And I've always seen, and I think a lot of people see, Victor, Driggs, Alpine as being part of our community. That's part of our workforce, too, and it just seems nuts to think that by creating new up-zone density, we can compete with prices in Driggs and Alpine and areas like that where they're not deed restricted. They don't need public subsidies. The prices are low. They've got, what is it, 17,000 unbuilt lots over in Teton County Idaho in that region. You know, for us to think we can meet some artificial 65 percent workforce thing just seems crazy, common-sense wise, plus, according to the Housing Authority, the Fall 2010 Report, 68 percent of the households here in Teton County Wyoming work here. That's doing pretty good. I mean, it's really doing well right now and the market has done well as it stands right now. And the second homes, they're not the enemy. I mean, that's part of Jackson Hole. It's a big part of our economy, second homes, and to come up with some artificial workforce housing thing as the driving force to meet some artificial standards just doesn't seem to make sense and it just creates this tension where you're dumping density in neighborhoods. So, thanks, and I apologize if I went too long the last time. Thank you guys for your public service. I mean, it's really appreciated. I mean, we just sort of show up in a cameo appearance; you guys do the work. Thank you.</p>
1/26/2012	Genzer, Jim Interested Public	<p>I'm Jim Genzer; I've lived in the community for 40 years, 38 of that right next door on Snow King Drive. And I would like, first of all, to say Patty Ewing's comments for Southeast Jackson is very appropriate to keep it as single-family housing. I think our numbers are very, very unrealistic, as Bill has mentioned. Doubling the size of the number of residences in the community is absolutely wrong. The double the size of commercial is absolutely wrong. Increasing areas like the Aspens and the Village by little pieces and then turn around and dumping the rest of the growth in the Town of Jackson is absolutely wrong. That is not the way things should happen. We...in the Town, the core commercial and resort areas to be expanded out to the...it used to be the Y, now the X, is a silly, silly thing. It will eliminate the western flavor, the western atmosphere that we have had for generations in Jackson Hole. That is not what we should be doing. If we want to be in step with a western community and the rest of the State of Wyoming, we will not do that kind of development. Can you imagine driving from the Y into Town with three-, four-story buildings in a dead zone? The only thing you can see is the antennas on top of Snow King. We're no different than any other city USA. If we want to keep the character of Jackson Hole, we do not allow the Town of Jackson to become the dumping ground for the community. None of this three-, four-story housing. We keep the character that we have right now. I think that, in order to do that, we have to eliminate the idea of having 65 percent of our employees housed in Teton County. That will not work. If we expect growth, 65 percent is wrong, and at a maximum, I would say 45 percent of employees that live in Teton County. And I thank you for the time that you have taken to listen to us and I really hope it engenders some revisions and attitude changes within our County and Town officials. Thank you.</p>

3: Town Residential Core

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Varley, Jay Interested Public	<p>My name's Jay Varley. I own property <<inaudible>>. I'd like to talk a little bit about Town as Heart, which was in the last Plan, and also about downtown as, let's say, heart of the heart, because I think that the density of the downtown area ought to be convenient to alternative modes of transportation. And actually the biggest one of that is walking. And so I think that we need to try to concentrate that development close to the center of Town. And when I talk about walking, you have to consider topography, too, because when there's some big elevation being like there is from down the Highway coming up, that discourages walking, too, so people won't walk as far. It also makes the bus transportation to be more effective as well. And that bus transportation also takes people to the supermarkets and other places that you ?? that you have downtown. So I'd like to encourage that. And I'd like to discourage too much development...to consider the Highway too much as the appropriate places for development. And it does encourage sprawl; it encourages people to drive to these places. I'm not saying you can just freeze the whole thing, but don't be highway oriented. That's just a typical American suburban type of development, so it needs to be more concentrated ?? And hopefully the areas that are not really on the Square, that they can develop as mixed-use and put people living there. And also in a way we can start getting the kinds of businesses, once there's enough critical mass in that area, to serve those people and we can have the kind of businesses that would attract the whole community at various times, as well as people living down there. I'm really looking more for a kind of a European village-type model. Usually very pedestrian oriented and relatively hard lines when you get out of it. That's my vision as to what I'd like to see. And I think there's a lot of advantages to it, you avoid sprawl, and it just is a more sensible way to live, and I think that's the way it's going to occur in the future anyway, like Town, of course. Oh, I'd also caution another thing, too. It's when the area gets too big, we take a risk of having development on the fringes where often the land is larger parcels, easier to develop, and we could end up with gaps between that...big gaps between that and the core downtown, which are like dead zones and people don't really want to walk through. It needs to be interesting through the whole thing for people to want to walk to it. So that's one of the hazards of getting too far out of the core with big developments. Thank you.</p>
1/26/2012	Jorgensen, Pete Interested Public	<p>I'm sorry, Pete Jorgensen and I live in Town. First, I've been involved in planning here since the '50s, having served as the local coordinator for the RUDAT study focused on South Park. Very simple and very straight forward; none of the recommendations in here were involved. I'd like to comment first on the fact that I don't know as much as you folks do <<inaudible>>. But I do appreciate these opportunities to make comments. I submitted written comments a couple of years ago, which I tried to review at your last public comment meeting ??, so I will keep this very short. And any comments I make tonight should not be taken personally, certainly not by these boards; the County Commissioners, that's another thing. I saw the first diagram you put up and it reminded me of something I saw in previous business, not here, somewhere else. The company I was working for did projects in Vietnam and somebody got and they drew three overriding circles or interlocking circles and tried to explain it that way. And, I'm sorry, I'm probably getting more dense as I get older, but I just don't understand where this is going, when the County has made such a commitment to open space, wildlife preservation, 97 percent federal land, which we hope is protected, conservation easements over 10,000, and I don't know exactly how many. I was a member of the three families who did the first nature conservancies in Wyoming at Skyline Ranch, four hundred dollars and 600 acres permanently preserved. I don't think we got anything out of it; we didn't have enough income to take a tax credit. But that's the history of this Valley. And I guess I don't want to say we shouldn't grow, but I will say the County shouldn't grow. We should split the County and the Town apart for purposes of long-range planning. The Town as Heart makes a lot of sense, but when you look at the implications of growth anywhere, and ultimately that's what happens right through the Village, it's easy to understand why WYDOT says, you've got to have the three lanes or five lanes. They project traffic 20 years in the future. Every projection that has been made in this County has been met or exceeded. There's no effort, no meaningful, serious effort by the planning entities, and again it's not you folks—it's the County Commissioners who have that authority to limit growth or control what happens. They were spending 80 percent on construction that was federal money; they have requirements that it meet certain standards. That's their job. They will do their job eventually. The second thing...and the third thing is the districts. And that's...15 districts is fine but the ones that make up the Town, Town as Heart are the important ones to consider more density. I don't know whether it should be there or not. We'll talk about that when you get to that point. But I urge you to try and take care of the County lands. Things Peter spoke to, there are not many properties left that have not been developed that would lend themselves to a large development where you would actually gain a conservation easement in exchange for density. So I would urge you to look carefully at the map and see what you're really talking about. You're clearly talking about the north end of South Park. That's been kicked down the road for 20 years, 30 years. And I'm not sure waiting for infill in Town is doing anything more than just delaying some definitive action that shows some limits. The timeline is another thing I would like to see, and I keep thinking these meetings are a chance that somebody is going to say that this is the deal and recommend it and the elected officials adopt it. But so far I don't have a sense of where we're going and when we're going to get there and I'd really like to have that. Thank you very much.</p>

3: Town Residential Core

Date	Name	Comment
1/16/2012	Karns, Pete Interested Public	<p>One of the dowfalls of creating land use rules and regulations is the "law of unintended consequences". Unfortunately, we already have some unintended consequences as a result of the Plan that is currently in place.</p> <p>Every day there are hundreds of our Jackson Hole workforce that commute from Star Valley and Idaho to get to their jobs. These commuters waste hundreds of man hours while on the road. They burn thousands of gallons of fossil fuel.</p> <p>They create tons of CO2. Many of them have been seriously hurt in accidents getting to and from their jobs. Some have even died.</p> <p>I am sure that our planners did not create this scenario on purpose when they were creating the current land use plan. However, I do consider this a failure on their part not to foresee what was going to happen.</p> <p>The unfortunate thing is that many of these workforce people would not be making this commute if they could find rental housing in Jackson Hole. During the boom years leading up to the economic downturn in 2007, apartment projects had waiting lists and people with jobs had no choice but to go outside the valley to find housing. Today, the problem is not as bad but still exists.</p> <p>If there is such a large demand for apartments in Jackson Hole, then why hasn't the private sector stepped up and built more apartment buildings? The answer is simple. There is not a zoning district in our current plan that adequately provides for the building of apartments. The only zoning district where apartments are feasible also allows condominiums and townhouses in the same district. It is far more profitable to build condos and townhouses and therefore they win out over apartments. What's more, even if a developer were to consider building apartments, the current zoning doesn't allow high enough density to make apartments economically feasible.</p> <p>There is a solution to this problem but it would take a major change in the direction that our planners are headed. The first step would be to create an entirely new zoning district in the Plan. This district, let's call it Workforce Housing, would need two major components. First, it would need to allow very high density multifamily housing. Secondly, it could not be subdivided. This would prevent it from being converted to condos at a later date. These two components would separate Workforce Housing from the current AR Residential zoning where condos and townhouses would continue to be built.</p> <p>These two components would also provide the opportunity and would carry the financial incentive for free enterprise to then step up and create the housing.</p> <p>The second step would be to find an area suitable to build such a project. I do not believe that there are any opportunities within the Town of Jackson to build such a project (except maybe the Rodeo Grounds if it were to be moved out of town). This leaves the north end of South Park as the next possibility. There may be other areas in the valley that could be considered.</p> <p>Some would say that building large apartment complexes in Jackson Hole would bring unwanted growth. I look at it differently. We would not be adding more people to the valley. Instead, we would be bringing home those people who already work here but are forced to live elsewhere. At the same time, we would be saving the environment, cutting back on pollution, reducing the use of fossil fuels, eliminating wasted man hours and possibly even saving lives. Let's get our workforce back in Jackson Hole where they belong.</p>

4: Mid-Town

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	<p>Hi, Becky Tillson, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. This has been the mark of the end of your years and years of involvement. I really just wanted to thank you. I know not all of you have been involved since the beginning, but it's been a massive effort and you've been really responsive to the community and I just wanted to thank you for that. We are ?? Resolution and we're generally supportive of the direction you're giving to the electeds, but I have a couple of additional suggestions to add tonight. First, the issue of infrastructure costs, the idea of development paying its own way, was not really covered last time due to time constraints. We hope that you'll revisit that today. Our commitment to growth paying its way should be included in the introduction to the maps, and we'd just appreciate a little bit of conversation about that. Also from last time, the conversation that was called down zoning, which wasn't really an accurate representation I don't think of what the public was asking for, but that was also cut off due to time. In our view, this issues ties into the permanency of open space projection, as well as the idea of producing the overall development potential countywide, and some direction from you guys with regard to that issue would also be much appreciated. Also I'm hoping you will consider adding a statement at the beginning of the maps that clearly establishes the prioritization of wildlife and natural resources. And I know Tyler mentioned that in his presentation, but a real clear statement in there not only that ?? being balanced with the other community goals but that that's the priority. I think there's just a little bit different wording that could clarify that. Specific to the districts, looking at District 4.5, which is Karns Meadow. Again, this has to do with balancing. It would be nice if you could clarify that wildlife needs will be prioritized over recreational needs in this sensitive location. A balance right now...it says it will be balanced. I think it's fair to say they should be prioritized. In District 5.6, I'm just curious as to where the reference to mixed-use development came from, and I didn't really hear that in your conversation and maybe if you could clarify your intentions around that, that would be helpful. Also in District 5.6, I think we need to clarify the language to say that the desired development pattern is not Town-level density, but rather closer to what the existing neighborhoods around there have, so that we don't get something that's super, super dense right there. We support the move to keep the Aspens, 12.2 District, stable, not transitional. As you know, it's already an overburdened road that has significant wildlife value in the area, so we support that. Lastly, in Districts 2, 3, 4, 5, and 13, those district descriptions would benefit from additional language reaffirming the importance of wildlife permeability. Again, kind of the central goal of this Plan. This is really something that Commissioner Newcomb had mentioned last time that also kind of got cut off due to time, but many areas in our community, even in Town, are either within or adjacent to wildlife habitat and public land, but there's not a butte in a riparian area for just kind of as open space. It all provides important wildlife habitat, and development does impact that, so if we could mention wildlife permeability in development of those districts, that would be helpful. A lot of the other districts already mention it but these ones didn't. Thank you again for all of your work on this. We look forward to seeing how these changes are incorporated and I thank you very much for your service.</p>
2/8/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	<p>Armond Acri, representing Save Historic Jackson Hole. We'd like to thank you guys for your efforts; I know you guys put a lot of time into it and we're close to the end. Thanks for what you've done. I'll focus my comments on items that were discussed last meeting where we feel we've gone off track. Area 3.2, District 3.2, Core District, public opinion favors two stories and you've gone to three, really question where that came from. Area 4.1, once again, public opinion, 70 to 80 percent favors three stories. This is all from the surveys that started back...and then I heard repeatedly during the open house meetings, and so again I think you've strayed off of what the public has asked you to do there. Five point six, redundant streets, grids and alleys, and mixed-use are not compatible with the adjoining neighborhoods. There's no alleys, I don't believe, west of Millward, so I'm not sure why all of a sudden we're going to jump to alleys in that area. That seems like again a ???. And the real question there is why is there so much detail on this when everything else was supposed to be at a higher level? This isn't supposed to be a Master Plan. I would suggest you go back to the previous statement, which was that it be compatible with the adjoining neighborhoods. That's a good statement, and when the time comes to develop it, then we can address the detail issue there. Teton Village, we would suggest that you not just limit them to footprint but also put in a statement that any increase in residential must come out of the Master Plan, as Commissioner Schwartz pointed out before. There is a Master Plan that's also binding, and so just to increase the density there would be a violation of that Master Plan. So, we ask you to go ahead and certify this and pass this along with the comment that you've heard the public has concerns about the issues that are not all resolved in the character districts, such as timing of the zoning discussions and decisions, and ask that the electeds resolve that at the next level. Thank you. Keep up the good work.</p>

4: Mid-Town

Date	Name	Comment
2/1/2012	Sibson, Barry Interested Public	<p>After four years of participation in the Comprehensive Plan process, I was quite pleased with the "Character District" plan for South Park. The key aspect of the SP plan was the preservation of the current open space. I am concerned, however, about the type of development and added population in the Northwest corner of the area and the concept of new roads connecting Melody Ranch, Rafter J and South Park Ranches.</p> <p>With the change of direction for the "Pines/Aspens" district, I am very concerned that there might be some thoughts of change in the South Park district. I believe that if any additional development were inserted in the SP district that it would be very detrimental to the South Park community, to wildlife movement and to the visual aspects of the approach to town.</p> <p>Important to me are:</p> <p>The open space in SP being permanently preserved, not just a zoning issue that could be changed in the future. Any development in SP should be tied contactually to preservation of open space in SP.</p> <p>A corridor for wildlife movement down the west side of SP. I live next to Bob Lucas's ranch and have frequently seen and heard elk migrating through his ranch. I believe that they come down through the Sherr Thoss property and not down Flat Creek.</p> <p>Maintenance of the rural view across SP from South 89 to the western mountains.</p> <p>Incentives for the SP ranchers to continue ranching.</p> <p>No additive development rights to those already existing.</p> <p>A decrease in allowable commercial development.</p> <p>Maintenance of a walkable town with a human scale to all development. Too many of the already developed 3 story buildings in town do not have that scale and are overwhelming. A step back of the third story should be required.</p> <p>I appreciate the fact that the proposed plan has been scaled down to be more in keeping with the desires of the community, but I DO NOT want South Park to become the default area for growth.</p>

4: Mid-Town

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	<p>Hi, I'm Becky Tillson, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. I wanted to start by thanking all of you guys for the enormous amount of time you've served the last couple of years. <<inaudible>>. So, thank you for all of that. Trevor covered earlier some of our most comprehensive ?? Those are also included in our written comments. I wanted to give just a couple of specific suggestions about the maps, district map on the ?? section. Overall, in the introduction, there needs to be a statement that clearly establishes the prioritization of wildlife and natural resources, which in this Plan is the well-documented will of the community. As we did for Buffalo Valley, it should be clear that choosing a goal of housing or workforce or whatever should not trump the top priority of wildlife protection. Also, in the introduction, the definition of conservation area should be clarified that we will not only be reducing impacts of development but actually the overall development potential in the area as well. And lastly—I think Greg mentioned this earlier—there needs to be a clear consideration of commercial development potential throughout the County ?? the need for housing and the amount and type of commercial development that works with ?? districts. Specific to the districts, there's just a couple of other things. In Districts #2 and 4, I think it would be important to clarify that Flat Creek enhancements are not only social but also <<inaudible>>. In District 2, we do agree that <<inaudible>>, but I just wanted to point out right now that we don't believe it's appropriate for the ?? to extend into District 4 unless it's really explicitly limited to existing nonconforming uses. District 5, <<inaudible>>. I think...I just wanted to make it clear that the idea is not to give an up zone in Northern South Park without first trying to do it elsewhere. It is a good idea to continue the discussion on linking development in this area to the growth management plan, and perhaps a solution maybe is to have linkage to the growth management plan include the caveat allowing for development that's associated with permanent open space protection ?? In District 6, I think I mentioned that it would be important to clarify that further subdivision should not be encouraged. District...the River Bottom District mentions ?? and I think that should be included in the Town and County Periphery districts as well. In #10, the wildlife corridors that was mentioned, that Rich was talking about, east/west, are important to point out. High-density development in the Aspens, which is an area with high wildlife values and existing road kill problems and transportation problems, as you all know, is not consistent with the goals of this Plan...high-density development in the Aspens is not consistent with the goals of the Plan. We don't know exactly how ?? is slated for that area, but it makes sense to really minimize that ?? In the Village, this new change that we've been talking about, about not increasing beyond the established footprint, we think it's a good idea, but we prefer to see the amount and type of that future growth. ?? development that will generate markets rather than ?? is really inappropriate. The balance of convenience commercial and workforce residential housing could be explored but only with some analysis of the <<inaudible>>. As we change the subdistrict lines, people should be able to maintain the rural character of that gateway area, preserving the rural character ?? really explicit having a change around the lines there. That's too much and I just wanted to thank you guys again for your years of service and ?? Thank you.</p>
1/26/2012	Genzer, Jim Interested Public	<p>I'm Jim Genzer; I've lived in the community for 40 years, 38 of that right next door on Snow King Drive. And I would like, first of all, to say Patty Ewing's comments for Southeast Jackson is very appropriate to keep it as single-family housing. I think our numbers are very, very unrealistic, as Bill has mentioned. Doubling the size of the number of residences in the community is absolutely wrong. The double the size of commercial is absolutely wrong. Increasing areas like the Aspens and the Village by little pieces and then turn around and dumping the rest of the growth in the Town of Jackson is absolutely wrong. That is not the way things should happen. We...in the Town, the core commercial and resort areas to be expanded out to the...it used to be the Y, now the X, is a silly, silly thing. It will eliminate the western flavor, the western atmosphere that we have had for generations in Jackson Hole. That is not what we should be doing. If we want to be in step with a western community and the rest of the State of Wyoming, we will not do that kind of development. Can you imagine driving from the Y into Town with three-, four-story buildings in a dead zone? The only thing you can see is the antennas on top of Snow King. We're no different than any other city USA. If we want to keep the character of Jackson Hole, we do not allow the Town of Jackson to become the dumping ground for the community. None of this three-, four-story housing. We keep the character that we have right now. I think that, in order to do that, we have to eliminate the idea of having 65 percent of our employees housed in Teton County. That will not work. If we expect growth, 65 percent is wrong, and at a maximum, I would say 45 percent of employees that live in Teton County. And I thank you for the time that you have taken to listen to us and I really hope it engenders some revisions and attitude changes within our County and Town officials. Thank you.</p>

4: Mid-Town

Date	Name	Comment
1/9/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	<p>If Save Historic Jackson Hole were allowed to participate in the "Red Dot" exercise this week, the attached list is where we would place our dots. After each dot is a brief explanation of why we would place our dots there.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•The Plan must include building and density numbers.<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦A Plan without metrics isn't a real plan.•Any density increase must be balanced with density decrease.<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦Permanent Protection of sensitive areas was and is the objective, not town growth.◦Protection of sensitive areas is what was sold to the public and the promise needs to be kept.•No Zoning changes and density transfer until a mechanism is in place.<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦With 50-70 years of growth already in the pipeline, we have time to get this right.•Protect rural character and small town atmosphere everywhere.<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦Jackson Hole is all about small town rural character; that's what we are.◦The current draft only extends this protection to the Town Square.•Eliminate contradictory and confusing definitions.<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦We can provide a list, but start with "stable" and "complete neighborhoods."•Do not encourage development in Northern South Park.<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦Infill in Town before we sprawl south.◦We do not want to refight the Porter Annexation battle.•Do not expand the Lodging Overlay.<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦The existing overlay already allows for more lodging, where's the need to make it larger? We are rarely at full occupancy now.•No Density increase in difficult/sensitive areas.<p>The following areas all have access problems and are adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. They should not see increases in density.</p><ul style="list-style-type: none">◦Between Broadway and Flat Creek in Midtown and Town Commercial Core.◦Steep hillsides at the "Y"◦Commercial development at the Aspens should not expand across 390.

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	<p>Hi, Becky Tillson, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. This has been the mark of the end of your years and years of involvement. I really just wanted to thank you. I know not all of you have been involved since the beginning, but it's been a massive effort and you've been really responsive to the community and I just wanted to thank you for that. We are ?? Resolution and we're generally supportive of the direction you're giving to the electeds, but I have a couple of additional suggestions to add tonight. First, the issue of infrastructure costs, the idea of development paying its own way, was not really covered last time due to time constraints. We hope that you'll revisit that today. Our commitment to growth paying its way should be included in the introduction to the maps, and we'd just appreciate a little bit of conversation about that. Also from last time, the conversation that was called down zoning, which wasn't really an accurate representation I don't think of what the public was asking for, but that was also cut off due to time. In our view, this issues ties into the permanency of open space projection, as well as the idea of producing the overall development potential countywide, and some direction from you guys with regard to that issue would also be much appreciated. Also I'm hoping you will consider adding a statement at the beginning of the maps that clearly establishes the prioritization of wildlife and natural resources. And I know Tyler mentioned that in his presentation, but a real clear statement in there not only that ?? being balanced with the other community goals but that that's the priority. I think there's just a little bit different wording that could clarify that. Specific to the districts, looking at District 4.5, which is Karns Meadow. Again, this has to do with balancing. It would be nice if you could clarify that wildlife needs will be prioritized over recreational needs in this sensitive location. A balance right now...it says it will be balanced. I think it's fair to say they should be prioritized. In District 5.6, I'm just curious as to where the reference to mixed-use development came from, and I didn't really hear that in your conversation and maybe if you could clarify your intentions around that, that would be helpful. Also in District 5.6, I think we need to clarify the language to say that the desired development pattern is not Town-level density, but rather closer to what the existing neighborhoods around there have, so that we don't get something that's super, super dense right there. We support the move to keep the Aspens, 12.2 District, stable, not transitional. As you know, it's already an overburdened road that has significant wildlife value in the area, so we support that. Lastly, in Districts 2, 3, 4, 5, and 13, those district descriptions would benefit from additional language reaffirming the importance of wildlife permeability. Again, kind of the central goal of this Plan. This is really something that Commissioner Newcomb had mentioned last time that also kind of got cut off due to time, but many areas in our community, even in Town, are either within or adjacent to wildlife habitat and public land, but there's not a butte in a riparian area for just kind of as open space. It all provides important wildlife habitat, and development does impact that, so if we could mention wildlife permeability in development of those districts, that would be helpful. A lot of the other districts already mention it but these ones didn't. Thank you again for all of your work on this. We look forward to seeing how these changes are incorporated and I thank you very much for your service.</p>

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	<p>Hi, Kathy Tompkins, Cottonwood Park neighbors. I just wanted to start out by saying that I really appreciate your patience and all your good work and lots of long nights. Beautiful views and wildlife don't stop at West Jackson. You also can't separate the negative impacts of a condensed Town density level subarea 5.6 from established residential neighborhoods and schools by a two-lane road. In Northwest South Park at Town density will degrade the character and integrity of Cottonwood Park and the schools along High School Road. Policy 4.3.a, aims to protect established neighborhoods. It states in the last paragraph character districts will aim to enhance these areas as complete neighborhoods without significantly increasing the allowable density. I think it states that and Northwest South Park is in our district now, District 5, West Jackson, and this policy should apply to Northwest South Park and how it affects our adjacent neighborhoods, because it's a lot of density if this thing goes through as it is. And, like I said, it doesn't stop at High School Road. We urge you to take mixed-use small lots and grid, alley terms out of District 5.6 that is Northwest South Park. This language opens the way for Town-level densities and at best a hopscotch inappropriate development that will seriously impact the schools and existing family neighborhoods. Please also delete any extra added industrial to Gregory Lane other than what's already entitled. I can already see the outcome of these details in 5.6 if they're not deleted. Investment money will go to projects that look great conceptually but will fail in reality because the funding will end at the street edge. We have seen this in the past, that people in blue-collar working-stiff neighborhoods, like mine, get nailed from both ends with higher taxes and failing roads. We end up with complicated out-of-proportion denying buildings for abandoned holes in the ground that don't do a thing for safe, walkable streets and a small-town feel. I walked back from Smith's yesterday on High School Road, which is, by the way, it is point eight miles from my front door, and I live at the west end of High School Road near South Park Loop Road. We are still sharing, through the years, to this day, through this process, we're still sharing High School Road this time of year with at best two feet between us and the traffic. We will be wasting millions of dollars on new infrastructure in Northwest South Park so I can drive past the convenience store across the road to go to a real store that has more than cigarettes and beer. If and when Town infill is mostly completed and Northwest South Park is needed to permanently preserve other lands in South Park, there should be a residential neighborhood that complements Range View Park density. But first, and I really, really think this is really important—but first make High School Road more welcoming to pedestrians and cyclists so we can walk or bike to the schools, Smith's and other businesses along High School Road. We are a heartier, healthier breed than the usual run-of-the-mill Wal-Mart shoppers in other cookie-cutter green-field developments. We don't notice the extra point three miles. Thanks a lot, guys, and again I really appreciate your hard work.</p>
2/8/2012	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	<p>Good evening, I'm Trevor Stevenson, speaking for the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. You all have a number of very specific things you're going to be working through this evening and I know you've just gained a number of other specific things that the public has brought up. I want to put you back at a couple of the really big issues that I think it's really important that you all, as a Joint Commission, weigh in on, recognizing that ultimately these will be decided by the elected officials but nonetheless that your input is very valuable on this. The first one is to make more clear in the Plan, and in particular in the character districts, that the intention is to shift development around, not to simply increase it in some of the areas, where we're seeing that clearly illustrated in the maps, but the intention is to balance that. There will be increases and there will be decreases associated with that. Sort of a statement of intent, clearly put within the character district maps, would again alleviate a lot of concern within the public that they're not seeing clearly illustrated there the intent to balance increases and decreases in density throughout the County, which I think is an idea that everybody supports. And you'd gain a lot more support for the Plan if that were stated more clearly in there. The second piece that I think is important for you to weigh in on, and I'm not sure really got addressed in your last meeting, was that the Alliance has made a recommendation that you consider more clearly stating the intent around the amount of development in each of the character districts. What we're talking about here is not buildout numbers, and I know you talked some about buildout numbers last time. But essentially the character districts describe the intent of the future of each area in the County and they describe it in textual terms. It sort of says, you know, the type of development that will be there. We think it would benefit the community greatly and benefit the Plan greatly if you could also give some direction, essentially a recommendation, to the electeds that it would be useful to also include the amount. You hear this consistently from the public and we heard a lot last time about the confusion about the amount of development that was being called for in the Aspens and that caused an uproar. Now there's confusion about the amount of development that is potentially called for in Northern South Park, Area 5.6. And we can kind of run into this over and over, but I think it would be useful to kind of explicitly name an intended amount, not a restriction, just an intent. So I would ask that you speak to that a little bit. And those are just a couple of the big issues that I think are really important for all of you, as a Joint Planning Commission, to weigh in on, and thank you for your insight on all this.</p>

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	<p>Hi, Rich Bloom for South Park neighbors. A hundred and seven meetings, four and a half years, I think I've been to 105 of them. Two things. One is just on the record Staff has promised to correct 10.2 to match 10.0 on the importance of the district's open space for wildlife movement. This will fix the incorrect statement in 10.2 that wildlife move solely along Flat Creek, so I just wanted to get it on the record, but Alex assures me that it will already be done. Staff has also promised to correct 10.1 to match the changes Staff has put forward on 10 and 10.2, that whole into and adjacent to existing developed areas. Is that the ?? language? I think Staff is planning new language. Clarify the goal of directing development that does occur into a transition area or clustering it near existing development with the incorporation of permanent open space. So that will apply to all those three areas that have that alternate language. I think that's a good compromise language. I think it respects all of our existing private property rights and it gets to the intent to let those landowners in central Northern South Park to cluster on their own properties. The big mistake and the thing we didn't get to in 5.6 is this clause that's on your modification that says, insert that it develop the subarea should include redundant streets, grids, alleys, small lots and a small area of mixed-use. Let's put mixed-use aside. The rest of that language should be removed, as it's in direct conflict with the existing language. The existing language says a possible location for residential development has a similar density to the adjacent West Jackson neighborhood. And it also says should development be needed, it should be the subject of a neighborhood planning effort so it will get to those details earlier. I talked to Alex at length Monday. I talked to Ben Ellis Thursday afternoon and we just had a hallway discussion. And what really happened there was Commissioner Ellis brought up the idea of shrinking 5.6 considerably by half or more, and perhaps increasing the density as a concept. And that's where he brought in the words of grid and alleys under that concept. It was discussed with that joint group and the group did not push either the grid, alleys forward or a change in the footprint. Unfortunately, Staff made the mistake of letting that language slip through. And by putting through that, and we'll go through these, redundant streets isn't really needed because 7.3.a, says all new developments have to have connectivity, interconnectivity; they won't be dead-end cul-de-sacs, so we have that covered. What grid, alleys and small lots infer to use that in Town, that's AR zoning. That's 16 to 18 dwelling units per acre. By referring to the neighborhoods across the street, you're looking at 4 or 5 dwelling units per acre. And what Ben Ellis—and he's here if you want to ask him—but I think what we were talking about is keeping that same amount of usage. Four to five is eight to a thousand homes. That's all of Melody Ranch, Rafter J and Cottonwood Park put together, which is half the amount you're trying to move around. If this language goes through, especially with the character-based Plan versus a numbers-based, it could infer AR zoning, which is 3000 to 3600 units. So the simplest thing to do is just to take out the grid, alleys and small lots and let that conversation come in in its entirety with the joint electeds so Ben Ellis can talk about reducing the footprint and looking at more density and have that conversation. So, the last thing is...and the same with redundancy. Redundant streets is covered in policy 7.3.a, and we also have that neighborhood planning effort coming up. Meanwhile, Barbara Allen brought up the idea about the adjacent neighborhoods and what that meant. I'm comfortable with the language as is, but I think for clarification you could say, for example, Range View Park, say you weren't talking about the apartment complex that's 24 dwelling units per acre for Ellingwood. So I would hope you would consider that. And then there was a conversation—it was very convoluted, Paul Duncker can fill you in if you want—about how we got to mixed-use. Well, by having mixed-use, that's ?? Mixed-use is commercial on the ground floor; we all know that. And yet we talk about this area being a residential use as its character. So the area is already within walking distance to local convenience. There's no need to have commercial. It would drive traffic into that area, through a school zone, and it would also pull the center of gravity from downtown by having commercial out on the periphery. So I think I would ask that you drop mixed-use. That came out of a County conversation from that because it's incompatible with the rest of the description in that area. That's it. I left that on your paper and thank you for your time as always. And I'm glad you're at the last of your 100 and some meetings.</p>

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Armond Acri, representing Save Historic Jackson Hole. We'd like to thank you guys for your efforts; I know you guys put a lot of time into it and we're close to the end. Thanks for what you've done. I'll focus my comments on items that were discussed last meeting where we feel we've gone off track. Area 3.2, District 3.2, Core District, public opinion favors two stories and you've gone to three, really question where that came from. Area 4.1, once again, public opinion, 70 to 80 percent favors three stories. This is all from the surveys that started back...and then I heard repeatedly during the open house meetings, and so again I think you've strayed off of what the public has asked you to do there. Five point six, redundant streets, grids and alleys, and mixed-use are not compatible with the adjoining neighborhoods. There's no alleys, I don't believe, west of Millward, so I'm not sure why all of a sudden we're going to jump to alleys in that area. That seems like again a ???. And the real question there is why is there so much detail on this when everything else was supposed to be at a higher level? This isn't supposed to be a Master Plan. I would suggest you go back to the previous statement, which was that it be compatible with the adjoining neighborhoods. That's a good statement, and when the time comes to develop it, then we can address the detail issue there. Teton Village, we would suggest that you not just limit them to footprint but also put in a statement that any increase in residential must come out of the Master Plan, as Commissioner Schwartz pointed out before. There is a Master Plan that's also binding, and so just to increase the density there would be a violation of that Master Plan. So, we ask you to go ahead and certify this and pass this along with the comment that you've heard the public has concerns about the issues that are not all resolved in the character districts, such as timing of the zoning discussions and decisions, and ask that the electeds resolve that at the next level. Thank you. Keep up the good work.

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
2/7/2012	Nolan, Ellen Interested Public	<p>I am writing to ask you not to change the comprehensive plan to increase density in South Park adjacent to Cottonwood Park neighborhood and the schools. This whole area is already very, very dense from Indian Trails, through the Blair House apartment complex, the affordable housing developments, Cottonwood Park, the schools and on to Gregory Lane industrial complex, and Smiths shopping center. In the past 12 years alone, I have seen traffic increase and the night sky dim with night light pollution.</p> <p>I understand that the landowners of NW South Park already have the right to develop their property as a residential neighborhood, but the changes you are discussing could increase the allowable density as well as permit light industrial or commercial development.</p> <p>In today's persisting economic climate, I do not understand why anyone wants to change the existing plan when there is apparently plenty of room to develop both residential and commercial space in town under the existing plan, and while sales of existing homes and vacant land have plummeted. Whose interests are you serving? I don't know anyone who thinks it is a good idea or even needed.</p> <p>I cannot improve on the following points, so please accept them as if I had written them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">o We do not want additional density dumped into South Park from anywhere else in the valley.o The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our South Park rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their lands in South Park.o Without this linkage – we do not support any additional density in NW South Park. We do not need any more development, and the sole reason for consideration of the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of South Park ranch lands.o The NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the in-fill potential in Town is completed.o If some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Rangeview Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park.o We do not need any additive industrial over what the entitlements already allow in the future on Gregory Lane that would worsen the safety issues for students and families using High School Road. The industrial areas just south of town are the more appropriate place for future light industry.o Most importantly, High School Road should be a residential and school campus road, period. We do not want it turned into a congested highway collector that would endanger the safety and lives of any school student or family residents living nearby.

Thank you for taking my concerns into serious consideration.

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
2/6/2012	Creel, Margaret Interested Public	<p>Thank-you for all the work that you have put in over the last number of years to make sure that you come up with a comprehensive plan that speaks to the needs and wants of this community. It has been a long process, one that I have paid close attention to, and one that simply seems to be in constant flux.</p> <p>Although I applaud you in your recent recognition of not increasing densities in the Aspens area, I strongly urge you to not add that density to other areas in Teton County, simply because you "have to put it somewhere". This is clearly not good planning. In particular, South Park in its entirety is not nor has it ever been the logical place to dump density although there are forces that are arguing to the contrary. As you move forward towards the conclusion and subsequent adoption of the new comprehensive plan, please uphold the map descriptions and delineations that affirm the scenic, wildlife, and ranching heritage values for all of South Park (District 10). In addition, do not even consider putting more density in the NW corner of South Park until infill in the town of Jackson has occurred. This alone could take years. As at least a half century of growth is already entitled here in Teton County, I would say it's a slippery slope to put together a plan that encourages more density and more development especially given our current economic climate. As much attention has been given to the fragmentation of South Park into the NW portion and other parts, let me be clear in stating that there needs to be significant clarification in the plan that ties any development in the NW portion of South Park to the permanent protection of the rest of South Park. Any development in Northwest South Park needs to be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands – period.</p> <p>To be quite honest, I do not support any kind of development in South Park. The recent deaths of moose along the Village Road has led to an outcry from many in the community. Why is it that the death of moose elicit more emotion than the death of deer, elk, coyotes, foxes, skunks, owls, hawks, mink and others? These are the animals that I have either seen killed or dead along High School Road, South Park Loop Road, and South Highway 89 over the years that I have lived in Rafter J. These animals are all using the corridors between the Snake River and the foothills to the West and East as well as moving both north and south in annual patterns. They do not understand delineations and designations. Although laudable that you are looking at the importance of the Flat Creek riparian area to wildlife, do not fail to recognize the importance of the larger land area of South Park and the habitat and food resources that it provides. I bet the wildlife that have no voice, will appreciate it.</p> <p>Again, thank-you for the time and effort you have put in towards coming up with a plan that speaks to the better good of this community in the future. Your attention to the importance of wildlife and their movements needs to continue to play a major role in what you decide as you move forward.</p>

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
2/5/2012	McGregor, Bob and Kim Interested Public	<p>I know you're hearing a lot these days - and I thank you for listening - but it's the same, familiar-by-now story that ordinary people have been trying to get across, since the early days of '08. Wildlife, wildlife crossings, neighborhood character, keeping rural places rural, and of course, my favorite, dumping of density, specifically into South Park.</p> <p>So, at the risk of redundancy, please uphold the map descriptions that affirm scenic, wildlife, wildlife crossings and rural heritage values of ALL of South Park. Also, any development in northwest South Park needs to be solidly linked to the large rural land stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands. Please, Please no dumping of density from places like Buffalo Valley or anywhere else into South Park. NO infill from town should be allowed anywhere until the town infill potential has been satisfied, nor any commercial in S.P. The people are just not into the rampant growth that could happen.</p> <p>Sorry to be a broken record here but these things are important and we've all slogged through 4 years of this comp plan revision process, to the tune of I've-forgotten-how-much public money. We've lived here 33-34 years, respectively, and have seen so many changes. Please, once again, listen to the common people and take these thoughts into consideration in your deliberations. At the moment we are out of the country and not able to attend meetings, but we have been to so many over the years, and are currently being kept up to speed via emails.</p> <p>Thank you again for taking the time to listen to 2 more residents of Teton County, and for considering what we've said.</p> <p>We look forward to resolving these issues soon, as we're sure you do as well.</p>
2/5/2012	Greger, Art Interested Public	<p>I am reading the Illustrating our Vision document on the comprehensive plan. What a beautiful picture of what I believe to be Phelps Lake. This illustrates very well what most people have indicated they want in this comprehensive plan... conservation. The nodes concept has been changed to complete neighborhoods, but the idea is the same. Growth in these areas has been consistently opposed - witness the opposition to growth in the Aspens just this week.</p> <p>I live in Rafter J and love the quality of life here; I oppose any development of South Park. It is probably the most scenic area that everyone sees coming into our tourist town. It needs to be preserved for its scenic and wildlife values as it is.</p> <p>I don't believe growth is really needed at this time. How long will the old Valley Feed sit empty? How long will the land west of Staples be for sale? How long will it take to sell the old Mojos, or the old Bubbas? How long will the new lots developed in Rafter J sit empty? When will the hole that is McCabe Corner turn into a swimming pool? How many people are trying to sell existing homes and can't? Infill and improvement are much more needed than more sprawl and area to be developed. A well developed line to the beginning of town exists at High School road, and should be preserved as such.</p> <p>I see in the plan increased connectivity with roads in the Rafter J area. This has been consistently opposed in the past (when the New Neighborhood was proposed) and will be opposed in the future, I am sure. No one I have ever talked to in Rafter J wants this. There is too much traffic here as it is.</p> <p>The process has been dragging on for years, and it is still uncertain how many homes, of what type, are going to be put in certain areas? A goal was predictability, and I don't see it. The comments made at the beginning of this process have been consistent, and should still be considered. Most working people don't have the time to follow this lengthy process, but their opposition to increased growth in South Park still stands.</p> <p>Please focus in conservation, infill of existing areas, and improving existing areas. Please conserve the beauty and character of South Park (and the whole valley for that matter) as it exists. Don't make South Park a dumping ground for unneeded and unwanted development.</p>

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
2/4/2012	Jerger, Karen Interested Public	<p>We would like all of you to know that we very much appreciate the careful thought and intensive energy that has gone into revising the Comprehensive Plan. It has been a long, hard process, but the final drafts seem to be much improved from the originals.</p> <p>With specific regard to South Park:</p> <p>We are pleased with the maps that acknowledge the importance of special qualities in South Park (scenic, wildlife, and ranching). Please hold firm to these positives in the final draft of the Plan.</p> <p>We do not want growth in South Park beyond what is currently entitled, however we support the idea of clustered growth in South Park that is directly tied to permanent open space protection of other land WITHIN the South Park area.</p> <p>We are concerned about the types of development that may be proposed for the NW section of South Park, and feel that it should be appropriate for a location that is close to existing neighborhoods and schools. This would eliminate any industrial and some commercial activities.</p> <p>Thank you for considering our comments.</p>
2/3/2012	Swope, Linda Interested Public	<p>You may remember the photo collage I sent you a few weeks ago - wildlife roaming through my yard in Melody Ranch... I have been pleased to see further progress made in the Comprehensive Plan to protect and value our truly unique resource. Thank you for listening to public input and acknowledging that our valley residents as a whole do treasure our wildlife.</p> <p>And for some of us in business here, we know that our clients are drawn here because the abundance is distinctive to Jackson Hole. The wildlife brings the families. The families book our services. We pay our taxes. Simple, really.</p> <p>And you know how we feel in South Park:</p> <p>Any development in Northwest South Park needs to be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands . We do not want unwanted density dumped into South Park from Alta, Buffalo Valley or anywhere else in the valley. The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their other South Park lands. Without this linkage – we do not support any additional density anywhere in our region – as we do not need any more development, and the sole reason for consideration of the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of these land owners other lands that dominate South Park. The NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the substantial in-fill potential in Town is completed. If some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Cottonwood Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park.</p> <p>South Park is a VITAL area for wildlife migration into our valley and beyond! The historic ranch district is the gateway...</p> <p>The danger now is writing in more growth. I don't know one valley resident that wants MORE growth. Please keep your ear to the ground. That rumble is us, the taxpayers who you represent.</p> <p>Let's keep the progress we've made and know when to call it good.</p> <p>Thank you for your time!!</p>

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
2/3/2012	Heileson, Marv and Juli Interested Public	<p>As you (finally!) finalize the Comprehensive Plan revision, please do not give up on South Park and treat it as the County's unloved stepchild. It would be totally unfair to use South Park as the density dumping ground for more development that no other neighborhood wants either. A lot of us have been reluctantly willing to tolerate some limited additional density in the northwest corner of South Park, so long as it 1) was only used to preserve rural land elsewhere in South Park, and 2) was consistent with the density of the surrounding neighborhoods. But any such development should not precede development in town; otherwise, the whole goal of "Town as Heart" would be meaningless.</p> <p>When Leland Christiansen was a County Commissioner, he stated at a South Park public meeting that "this is the community's plan." Planning Commissioner Patricia Russell said essentially the same thing at a meeting last month. Over the last four years, the community has said over and over that they don't want more density added to the valley. We already have zoning enough to double the growth we have now; if this is really the community's plan, how can it identify more "spots" for additional density? The only people that would benefit from more growth are the few large landowners/developers that want to make money at the expense of everything else, including residents, wildlife, and ultimately the economy of Jackson Hole, which is so dependent on the quality of its environment – both natural and built.</p> <p>The proposed plan started out by offering up South Park as a sacrificial lamb to growth. Over the last four years, thanks to vigorous input from the community, and responsiveness from the electeds, it has been changed to be more responsive to preserving the qualities that make South Park a primary contributor to the overall special quality of Jackson Hole. We're almost there; please stay the course, preserve the character of South Park and in turn the valley as a whole.</p>
2/2/2012	Dunlap, Dave Interested Public	<p>I am opposed to using the South Park area as a dumping ground for the rest of the county. Adding anywhere near 1000 homes is shortsighted and voids any concern for wildlife and responsible growth.</p> <p>I have been participating for four plus years in this process – I expect you to UPHOLD the map descriptions that now affirm the scenic, wildlife, wildlife connectivity and ranching heritage values of ALL of South Park (called district 10).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We do not want additive growth from anywhere in the valley when we already have 50-70 years of growth already entitled – a rough doubling of our built environment on the ground today! • Any development in Northwest South Park needs to be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands . We do not want unwanted density dumped into South Park from Alta, Buffalo Valley or anywhere else in the valley. o The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their other South Park lands. o Without this linkage – we do not support any additional density anywhere in our region – as we do not need any more development, and the sole reason for consideration of the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of these land owners other lands that dominate South Park. o The NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the substantial in-fill potential in Town is completed. o If some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Cottonwood Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park.

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
2/2/2012	Harvey, Ann Interested Public	<p>I am writing once again to comment on the seemingly endless comprehensive plan process. The bottom line, I think, is that you need to ensure that the plan lives up to its lofty ideals of protecting wildlife, habitat, scenery, and the other values that define Jackson Hole. You do not do this by adding more growth, whether it's in Wilson, the Aspens, South Park, or anywhere else in the valley. The more growth the plan allows, the more fragmented and degraded wildlife habitat becomes, and the more Jackson Hole resembles all the other places where humans dominate the landscape. Please stop thinking in terms of nodes, or spots, or whatever other cancerous terms describe additive growth in Jackson Hole. We do not want or need a plan that calls for more growth. It's hard to imagine what Jackson Hole will be like with the doubling in growth that's already allowed--how can you possibly think that it's your duty to encourage even more?</p> <p>When will specific mechanisms for decreasing development in rural areas, and permanently preserving open space, be revealed to the public? Learning from the newspaper that there's a lot of "flexibility" in how 2000 potential units will be shifted from rural areas to denser areas does little to inspire confidence that this is anything more than fantasy. It's a laudable ideal to concentrate growth in the town of Jackson and decrease it in the rural parts of the valley, but until the second part of the equation is dealt with, you shouldn't be even considering additive growth anywhere in the County. After 4 years of planning, shouldn't the means of decreasing density be figured out? It's easy to allow more growth and hard to preserve open space, but taking the path of least resistance is not exactly good planning.</p> <p>I'm glad to see that the current version of the plan calls for preserving much of South Park instead of making the whole thing a density dumping ground. Please stick to this. And if any increase in density is approved for the Northwest corner, it must be clearly tied to decreasing density and permanent open space protection throughout the rural areas of South Park. The map descriptions should affirm this and be consistent with the plan language. No density increase should be directed to South Park until the Town has reached its infill potential. And no commercial development should be allowed in South Park.</p> <p>I am also entirely supportive of the Village Road residents who object to adding growth to the Aspens area. It just doesn't make sense to do that, given transportation and infrastructure issues, as well as wildlife values in that part of the valley.</p>

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
2/2/2012	Campbell, Leon G. Interested Public	<p>For four long years, elected officials and the Jackson Community have been working on the draft Comprehensive Plan which, when completed, will establish the future character of the Jackson Hole Valley for generations. It has been a long and exhaustive process which remains unfinished yet is being scheduled for completion early this year.</p> <p>It is ironic, despite the long hours devoted to such an important document, that the draft today is hardly comprehensive in the sense that maximum densities are still not established and thus, residential areas including Jackson, the Aspens, South Park and Teton Village fear that additional density from the more remote reaches of the County will be visited upon them in the new Plan, robbing them of their cohesion and unique character. These neighborhoods are in competition with each other to remain relatively rural and open.</p> <p>The Plan must mandate that infill development first be approved in Jackson, but only to a point where the town is able to preserve its Western frontier character as the "Last Best Place" in a rapidly urbanizing nation. However, if growth limits are established for Jackson, it is also necessary to limit the growth in the above neighborhoods at the amount entitled in 1994 which presently allows doubling of the built environment! For elected officials to permit additive growth in these several residential areas in the new Plan is madness. Additional densities can be left to future generations if the situation so dictates well into the future.</p> <p>In the South Park neighborhood, as an example, good planning would dictate that High School Road, which bisects the Northwest corridor of this neighborhood, remain rural to encourage walking and bicycling and minimizing automobile traffic. If development of the northwest quadrant of South Park results in residential growth in view of 1,000 homes it would exceed the size of Cottonwood Park, Rafter J and Melody Ranch neighborhoods combined!</p> <p>Moreover, any density approvals in northwest South Park must be linked to and contingent upon large landowners and the Jackson Hole Land Trust securing permanent conservation easements on the southerly part of South Park which not only functions as a scenic gateway to Jackson but an important wildlife corridor as well.</p> <p>A truly Comprehensive Plan, which has the primary objective of keeping rural, more distant and detached parts of the County, hardly is intended to accept growth from other parts of the Valley such as Alta and Buffalo Valley, at Jackson's expense nor to encourage additional commercial, industrial or mixed-use projects which additive density would demand.</p> <p>Density maximums must be established in the Plan so that growth is sequentially established in Jackson and its several residential communities consistent with their historical character. This is the key component of the Plan that the public has demanded of elected officials for four years and which is still not clarified in the latest draft. The community has spoken plainly that it does not wish additive growth. Nor does it have the funds or inclination to pay infrastructural costs of such growth. If elected officials recognize this fact and institutionalize it with growth limits and density maximums it will become abundantly clear that Jackson has 'men who match our mountains' who have served this community faithfully and well.</p>
2/2/2012	Vito, Kristin Interested Public	<p>For four years, community members have consistently asked for one thing in the comprehensive plan--keep the character of South Park rural. The sole reason for any density increase in NW South Park should be for permanently protecting open space in the remainder of South Park. Please note this community request in the appropriate map descriptions.</p>
2/1/2012	Coelho, Katherine and Interested Public	<p>In regards to the growth plan, we need to permanently conserve the large rural ranches in the NW area of South Park. These ranches help make Jackson Hole one of the most beautiful areas in the U.S. Since the majority of our economy is tourism, it is of them up most importance to preserve the beauty of the area. If it becomes necessary for some small development of this area to help the ranchers conserve the rest of their property then the development should be only in the NW corner and in the same density and character as its neighbor Cottonwood Park. As to any other increase in density in South Park it is totally unnecessary as we have 50-70 years of lands of entitled growth all ready planned for. No leap frogging - in fill must be done first.</p> <p>We also must preserve the linkage for the wild life. In all the meetings I have attended the audience has said that the wild life of Jackson Hole is one of its most important attributes for residents and visitor alike.</p> <p>Lets keep Jackson as what it is know for; wilderness, wild life and the old West.</p>

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
2/1/2012	Dawson, Ted Interested Public	<p>Please protect the south corridor and entrance into our Valley!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• We do not want additive growth from anywhere in the valley when we already have 50-70 years of growth already entitled – a rough doubling of our built environment on the ground today!• Any development in Northwest South Park needs to be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands – period. We do not want unwanted density dumped into South Park from Alta, Buffalo Valley or anywhere else in the valley.o The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their other South Park lands.o Without this linkage – we do not support any additional density anywhere in our region – as we do not need any more development, and the sole reason for consideration of the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of these land owners other lands that dominate South Park.o The NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the substantial in-fill potential in Town is completed.o If some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Cottonwood Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park.
1/31/2012	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	<p>The guests to southern entrance of our Valley should not be met with a whole lot of development and really impacting our animal corridors!</p> <p>When residents of the Aspens, Westbank and other areas say they don't want to be targeted for growth, I support their concerns for sprawl and over development 100%. Being from Cottonwood Park we too have the same concerns about green field development and traffic congestion, especially on High School Road. Throughout the Comprehensive plan process, residents of Cottonwood Park have demanded that there should be no dumping of additive growth anywhere in the valley. The focus for preserving open space should come first. Then town infill should come next.</p> <p>Northwest South Park should not be the dumping ground for the valley's growth problems. The only clustered development that should be transferred to NW South Park is the minimal development rights from the South Park area itself by working with South Park's large land owners and the Land Trust using the proper incentive tools, to permanently retire the desired open space there.</p> <p>To think that dumping town density growth into the North West corner of South Park will protect other areas like the Aspens and the Westbank from growth is a fantasy. We can't afford additive growth anywhere in the valley when we have 50-70 years of growth already entitled. We must not rely on up zoning NW South Park and down zoning other areas. All it takes is a simple vote in the future to change it. We will only end up with additive growth on top of the already entitled growth without solving the problem the Aspens and other areas are worried about. It will be too late then. South Park will become a sprawling unwelcome place to live.</p> <p>We will lose the great middle class family neighborhoods to industrial traffic and unsafe streets around the schools. Then, after South Park is ruined, the Aspens and other areas of the valley will be once again, targeted, because we didn't have permanent protection of sensitive areas, we didn't have a plan with real numbers, we didn't have a plan that stated any density increase should be balanced with density decrease, we didn't have a plan that followed through with town infill first, we didn't have a plan that said no to zoning changes that can be easily reversed at the whim of whoever is in office.</p> <p>I know there will be a neighborhood across from us someday. It should be complimentary to Cottonwood Park at a similar density to Rangeview Park with open space along High School Road. High School Road should be a residential road to encourage walking and biking. There should be no industrial or commercial development along High School Road or in the NW corner. It will end up a failing; congested road that not even a connector road will help unless we only allow a small residential neighborhood in the NW corner. Being from Cottonwood Park I could easily say no growth in NW South Park. Put it in the Aspens, put in the Westbank. I won't, because they too are great neighborhoods that deserve protection of their rural character and small neighborhood atmosphere. Cottonwood Park and the neighborhoods around High School Road should not be excluded from that same protection.</p>

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
1/30/2012	Salter, Andy Interested Public	<p>I am a resident of South Park, I have been closely following your efforts over the past four years to revise the Comprehensive Plan and I have written you previously to express my views.</p> <p>PLEASE UPHOLD the map descriptions that now affirm the scenic, wildlife, wildlife connectivity and ranching heritage values of ALL of South Park (district 10).</p> <p>Please do not saddle South Park with additive growth from anywhere in the valley when we already have 50-70 years of growth already entitled – a rough doubling of our built environment on the ground today!</p> <p>Any development in Northwest South Park needs to be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands – period. Unwanted density should NOT be dumped into South Park from Alta, Buffalo Valley or anywhere else in the valley.</p> <p>The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their other South Park lands.</p> <p>oWithout this linkage – I do not support any additional density anywhere in our region – as we do not need any more development in South Park, and the sole reason for consideration of development in the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of the balance of the lands in South Park.</p> <p>oThe NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the substantial in-fill potential in Town is completed.</p> <p>oIf some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Cottonwood Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park.</p> <p>Much progress has been made during the course of your deliberations to protect South Park, its vistas and its wildlife migration routes and I sincerely appreciate your efforts in that regard. Please remain steadfast in your commitment to protect our beautiful portion of the valley.</p>
1/30/2012	Rhea, Rebecca Interested Public	<p>I have owned a home in Single Tree Ranch Subdivision for the past 7 years and lived in many different places in Jackson Hole since 1978. For more than 3 decades I have witnessed many failed planning efforts in Jackson Hole. It seems like the developers always win. I think it is finally time to set reasonable growth limits and once and for all to protect neighborhoods so the quality of life, social, scenic and wildlife values that make Jackson Hole a desirable place to live, work, and vacation are not sacrificed. I believe it is important to keep population growth and development at reasonable levels so there is adequate infrastructure. Infrastructure needs must be able to be met within the current and projected tax revenues.</p> <p>I have a particular interest in District 10 (South Park) where I live. This district is significant habitat for wildlife and is particularly important for migrating elk and wintering moose. I have personally observed more than 100 elk at a time spend several weeks in the ranch land adjacent to my house, observed elk in my backyard and migrating through my neighborhood. I frequently see moose, coyotes, fox, bald eagles, and osprey from my house. Trumpeter swans, Canada geese, Great Blue Herons, numerous other birds and mammals live in or pass through South Park.</p> <p>I have been participating in the latest comprehensive plan effort for the past four years. I strongly believe that it is not appropriate to increase the density of South Park as a trade off for reducing density elsewhere. South Park has already been developed to a level that should not be exceeded after buildout of existing lots is complete.</p> <p>Sub-area 5.6 should be strictly tied to the minimum amount of growth so there can be permanent conservation of the large rural landowners other South Park Lands. Development of this area should complement the existing development there, particularly the three school campuses.</p> <p>The South Park Loop road cannot handle increased traffic without being widened which would destroy its rural character and recreational values.</p> <p>This planning effort needs to be finally completed so that the time and energy of elected officials and landowners can be better spent on preserving what is best about Jackson Hole and meeting the other challenges of the future.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of my position on this matter.</p>

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
1/30/2012	Van Gelder, Bill Interested Public	<p>With much frustration it has been brought to my attention that South Park is again back on the table for additional unrestricted density.</p> <p>I feel frustrated as over the course of this very long, drawn out process, it has been made consistently clear by the community by that south park should not be the place for unrestricted development in the new comprehensive plan. Now it appears, at the very last minute, the language previously agreed to preserving the rural nature and scenic value of South Park is going to be significantly weakened.</p> <p>I am not opposed to developing of South Park, and feel that north western south park is appropriate for higher density, however I STRONGLY urge this upzoning of northwest south park needs to be tied to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help the rural land owners of south park achieve permanent conservation of their lands. Without this linkage I do not support any additional density in South Park, and I do not support this upzoning of North West South Park until ALL of the in Town potential infill is created. Furthermore if the development of NW south park is needed, it should be residential in nature (similar to Cottonwood Park), not commercial or industrial. We don't need town and south park to morph into a mini metroplex of urban sprawl seen from Colorado Springs to Fort Collins.</p>
1/30/2012	Gammer, Michele Interested Public	<p>I write to you as a resident of South Park. I have been attending meetings and following developments on the Comprehensive Plan over the past four years. I have written to you previously to share my viewpoint.</p> <p>I respectfully urge that you UPHOLD the map descriptions that now affirm the scenic, wildlife, wildlife connectivity and ranching heritage values of ALL of South Park (district 10).</p> <p>Please do not burden South Park with additive growth from anywhere in the valley when we already have 50-70 years of growth already entitled – a rough doubling of our built environment on the ground today!</p> <p>In addition, I request that any development in Northwest South Park be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands – period. Unwanted density should NOT be dumped into South Park from Alta, Buffalo Valley or anywhere else in the valley.</p> <p>The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their other South Park lands.</p> <p>Without this linkage – I do not support any additional density anywhere in our region – as we do not need any more development in South Park, and the sole reason for consideration of development in the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of the balance of the lands in South Park.</p> <p>The NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the substantial in-fill potential in Town is completed.</p> <p>If some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Cottonwood Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park.</p> <p>To date, much progress has been made during the course of your deliberations to protect South Park, its vistas and its wildlife migration routes and I sincerely appreciate your efforts in that regard. Please remain steadfast in your commitment to protect our beautiful portion of the valley.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my input.</p>

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
1/30/2012	Balogh, Holly Interested Public	<p>I am a resident of Melody Ranch where my family has lived for the past 11(!) years. As a concerned citizen about growth and most importantly about the wildlife and wild lands in this region, I wanted to provide some comments about the planning process.</p> <p>I took time out of my schedule to attend one of the mapping and planning workshops in Rafter J back in October. Prior to that, I had participated in other planning discussions over the past several years. From these discussions, I expect that the commission will uphold the descriptions that were discussed and commented on for all of South Park – district 10. It was very clear that the majority of residents at the mapping discussion holds scenic, wildlife, and wildlife connectivity as sacred and fully expects that these values will be addressed and not compromised in the final plans.</p> <p>It is extremely important to me that there is no additional growth placed in the valley when we already have 50 plus year of growth already entitled. It is also extremely important to me that development in Northwest South Park be linked to the large rural land owner steward in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands. Without this linkage the entirety of South Park could be developed – completely destroying the values we all hold so dear.</p> <p>Moreover, I think it extremely important that development be completed in town and any potential development be finished their before expansion into other rural Teton county areas. If we do develop part of the NW corner of South Park, let's be smart. Let's develop it like Cottonwood or Indian Trails and not destroy the residential areas with commercial or other mixed use that makes parts of Town, and areas behind Smiths look like a total junk show from any outsider's observations.</p> <p>I'd like to remind you about our wildlife. We must make these steps to protect our animals who share our space. We choose to live here and want to keep our wildlife alive. Providing them room to roam is critical to their long term survival. This month alone I have had two different mom and baby moose sets, bald eagle, fox, and trumpeter swans in my back yard. Help me help them by protecting this crucial.</p> <p>Thank you very much for listening. Please feel free to contact me for further discussion.</p>

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
1/28/2012	Bloom, Rich	Outcomes related to PRD, District's 5.6 and 10 from Thursday's meeting.
	Interested Public	I hope to see some clarification on several of these decisions before the staff report - not only by the joint planning commission meeting on Thursday but also the County meeting on January 12 - as I do not believe you have captured the strong intent on some of these decisions – especially on the intent of 5.6 and its linkage to 10.1 and 10.2.
		So here is what I heard from the joint planning commission meeting (plus some additional notes in a few areas from the joint electeds/planning commissions meetings of the County on January 12 and Town on January 11):
		PRD and clustering tools:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• PRD and clustering options were re-affirmed Thursday as critical to large land owner options. That will be incorporated into the plan body more clearly.• The direct reference in the tables of clustering – thus PRD option on properties only at 160 acres and above – was removed Thursday. Everything from 35 acres up should have clustering incentives.
		Area 5.6
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Area 5.6 — now a clear direct link to these two owner's other properties in 10.2 and also district 9 (Snake River bottom properties below Shooting Iron).• Clarifying the intent of 5.6 is to use the PRD and non-contiguous PRD (with these land owners disconnected other properties along the Snake River) to achieve permanent open space throughout South Park - and other rural areas if a TDR tool is ever successful.<ul style="list-style-type: none">o This is the key point also confirmed by the County Commissioners – which has yet to be made clear. I expect language that shows the clear linkage here as both bodies where clear in their direction. You can leave an opening to transfer from other rural lands outside of South Park – but we know there are significant barriers to that being realized.• In-fill priority to town remains first – but should not preclude a meaningful proposal from the families (Gill and Lockhart) that protects important scenic, wildlife and wildlife connectivity - as well as agricultural heritage - parcels in South Park – especially as controlled by these same owners.<ul style="list-style-type: none">o The County also took this position but, like the above, you have not captured their clear intent. I expect to see that clearly stated.• On cutting the reason for “before in-fill” – the planning commissions clearly cut “workforce housing” and “other community benefits” – not because those do not have value – but they should not be reasons to move forward on 5.6 before Town, and other complete neighborhoods, achieve in-fill.<ul style="list-style-type: none">o The joint County meeting January 12 – again it was not discussed about other community benefits period, meanwhile Hank Phibbs got no other elected support on adding workforce housing as a reason to proceed on 5.6 before in-fill in Town. In fact Paul V. opposed that idea.<ul style="list-style-type: none">o Meanwhile the Town joint meeting from January 11 clearly stated in-fill first period – tied to the growth management plan – with no other conditions or triggers.
		District 10, sub-area 10.1 and 10.2
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 10.1 language will stay the same on the intent is to preserve these critical open space areas – clarification will be added that if clustering development is needed to do that – that it should be directed to the north into area 5.6. This is an aspirational goal that does not preclude Seherr-Thoss by clustering adjacent to either South Park Ranches or Melody Ranch – but the big idea of the plan is to see if there is a way to transfer development potential to the north into area 5.6• 10.2 – again both the joint planning commissions and the County meeting from January 12 clearly responded to the obvious link since 80% of 10.2 are the same land owners that own 100% of area 5.6. I expect to see clear language and direction recognizing that both groups affirmed this. So very clear language on preserving the area is the intent – and if some development is necessary to achieve that due to clustering incentives – then to the north into area 5.6. Again this is aspirational so does not preclude Lucas from doing an independent PRD and have that clustered potential move next to South Park Ranches in the southern portion of his parcel. But the big idea of course in the plan is to see if that potential can be moved to the north

5: West Jackson

Date Name

Comment

into area 5.6.

•The focus is on achieving permanent protection through the PRD and possible TDR – and not through zoning alone in 10 and 5.6. District 5.6 is truly unique in its potential to use existing tools on the books to achieve the plan's goals. I would remind you also that there are 35 acres zoned Suburban in the NW corner of 5.6.

•10.2 – Both language and mapping on wildlife movement throughout the district that matches the description in the general introduction mentioned in 10. Both groups by default affirmed that – and staff has said they already intend to correct those biological mistakes that claim the only wildlife movement of large mammals is along Flat Creek. Alex has assured me these green changes have been captured (E-W and N-S) - and will be made - but I have yet to see them listed in a list of proposed changes.

oNOTE: when I drove home late Thursday evening another elk had just been killed on the Lockhart side of HWY 89 just ¼ mile south of Smith's. This is the same area between Smiths and Rafter J that has been shown for thirty years to have the highest wildlife collision rate between Smiths and Hoback junction on HWY 89. The group of elk had traversed from west to the east across sub-area 10.2 to reach the Snow King highlands – and one member was killed as they crossed Thursday evening.

I also felt the discussion well after the 9pm cut-off perhaps did not allow the joint planning commissions time to address the issue on "mixed use" in area 5.6. If they do not revisit that – then it will be raised again with the electeds in March as I see mixed use not only not compatible in this residential area – but also a clear threat to redevelopment and reinvestment in the Town by bringing those uses so far out to the peripheries of Town. Clearly the public has said if 5.6 becomes necessary to achieve open space protection in South Park – that they expect 5.6 to be residential, with a mix of housing types and a density that reflects the Cottonwood Park neighborhood across the street. Staffs' addition of "gridded streets and alleys" – which has not been brought up by any electeds or planning commissioners – could be misinterpreted that you are suggesting a character different from what the citizens have clearly articulated.

I appreciate staff's work on the plan – but I am also frustrated that staff seems to not be fully recognizing both public input and electeds/planning commission directives without adding their own personal bias. Perhaps that is unavoidable - so I hope you take my perspectives and comments in the spirit they are offered. If need be I would be happy to have a few score of residents at the February 8 and/or March 12 meetings to reinforce their passion for these changes - at the same level you have recently heard from other areas in the valley.

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	<p>Good evening, Rich Bloom, representing South Park neighbors. You know my comments, you know my public positions and my overarching concerns which ??, but I want to give you the specifics, so please take some notes. In area 10.2 and in 10, I think Staff's going to make these changes already, but we have some incorrect mapping of the elk and deer movements. Elk and deer do not cross the Highway and come down through the forest and then march along Flat Creek through Melody Ranch and through Rafter J. They actually move throughout the district. And so the introduction in 10 talks about wildlife moving through the district, and in 10.2, you just need to clarify that and reinforce the what's already in here. If lines are to be on the map, too, I think through a lot of districts some L-shaped lines that show east/west and north/south movement ?? is appropriate for that district. Again, the ?? and that's green changes. But the big one is I want to look at 5.6. I think all of you have read the Land Trust letter and this is the big idea that is in this Comp Plan. This is about how to protect permanent open space, you know, in rural areas. And so the whole point was not the shifting of the numbers or ???. It was using that as an ends to a means, or a means to a end, and the end is conservation. And the greatest opportunity we have in the Plan, and probably the only one that's really realistic, are the current zonings in the LDRs is in South Park. It...the 5.6 area is about 200 acres, about equally split between Rob Gill and Shelly Lockhart. Those two landowners just south of that have another 350 acres. In addition, both of them own another 600 acres below Shooting Iron, so we're talking about 2200 acres. So, both of them have great ability, without having to cooperate with anybody else, to shift that density up into a location that makes more sense. And so in 10.2, about 90 percent, 80 percent of that is those two landowners. There is a parcel by Wilson near Rafter J; he's already conserved about half of it. And then there is the Lucas parcel, about 200 acres, meaning Rafter J, Three Creeks and South Park Ranches. So, there's some language you're going to be dealing with tonight about moving development into or adjacent to existing developed areas to the ones to the south, which leads to complete confusion. That could be simply corrected about moving it in area 10.2 to the north into area 5.6. It's very clear. It gives those landowners and the Land Trust and the public clear direction to see what can be accomplished. The County did affirm that in their discussions. As far as timing, the County actually affirmed the idea of infill first in the Town, because area 5.6 could be a threat to investment in Town. But what they're really trying to say is the big idea was how do you conserve permanent open space? And the clock ticks on these families because of estate planning needs, and if those families have an opportunity to resolve that land and do a PRD amongst themselves, I think they would be ?? out any development and over time it wouldn't be a threat. So I think there's accommodation between what Town said, which is completely valid, about linking it to the growth management plan but allowing the opportunity. What is a threat is language that Staff added in where they linked an earlier timeline on area 5.6 to not just the open space protection but to a workforce housing opportunity, which would happen by default anyway, or other community benefits. And so I think you open the door by saying we want to do infill first unless we get another Teton Meadows Ranch that shows up there. Well, that would be a direct threat to investment in Town I think to those coming in contradiction versus achieving permanent open space. So think about that and just link it to the permanent protection. That's the idea. You just need to recognize this parcel is very unique because of the ownership and the control there. By doing it just to the north into 5.6 does not leave the Lucas's out. They could work with the family or they always have the right to cluster themselves on their own parcel down by South Park Ranches. I think you want some aspirational goals here. We all agree I think we'd like it up there by Cottonwood to achieve permanent open space. Thank you.</p>

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	I think I will be less than three minutes. <<inaudible>>. I was going to make specific comments, but I did want to say that I agree with ?? concerns that too many members and organizations like Save Historic Jackson Hole and the Conservation Alliance have expressed and have written to you and the elected officials about those. I wanted to make a comment about District 5.6. The fundamental principle behind increasing density in this district is conservation of the open space in middle and Southern South Park, and let's not lose sight of the fact that conservation of wildlife and open space is the justification for increases in development elsewhere in the County. There's a unique opportunity to work with large landowners in South Park to do this. And people before me have mentioned how effective the PRD tool has been in the past and how beneficial it has been to the community. So, just the section there should read do not preclude the opportunity for meaningful permanent conservation of open space in rural areas, period. Workforce housing may benefit from this increased density, but is not the driving force behind it. And also the term other community benefits is vague and effectively a loophole, so I don't think that should be in there. Also, mixed-use does not belong in District 5.6. There's a commitment to make this neighborhood consistent with the adjacent neighborhood, Cottonwood Park, where there's mixed housing, not mixed-use. I don't think that belongs there. And then for sections 10 point...just 10 in general and 10.2, the goal for District 10 is to try to preserve permanent open space in middle, southern and other areas of South Park by directing development to northwestern South Park. This is as simple as encouraging the two largest landowners in this district to concentrate development on their respective properties in Northwest South Park. So, a statement which more accurately reflects this goal would read something like any development that might occur in South Park will be directed to Northwest in subarea 5.6, something like that. And then also about the wildlife movement in District 10, I think that needs to be...well, Section 10.2, wildlife movement in this district occurs throughout, not just along the Flat Creek corridor. Someone mentioned that before. So, add language to describe that it's east to west, as well as north to south, movement of elk and other species, and this would provide a more realistic description and it would be consistent with the overall description mentioned above in District 10. Thank you.
1/26/2012	Jorgensen, Pete Interested Public	I'm sorry, Pete Jorgensen and I live in Town. First, I've been involved in planning here since the '50s, having served as the local coordinator for the RUDAT study focused on South Park. Very simple and very straight forward; none of the recommendations in here were involved. I'd like to comment first on the fact that I don't know as much as you folks do <<inaudible>>. But I do appreciate these opportunities to make comments. I submitted written comments a couple of years ago, which I tried to review at your last public comment meeting ??, so I will keep this very short. And any comments I make tonight should not be taken personally, certainly not by these boards; the County Commissioners, that's another thing. I saw the first diagram you put up and it reminded me of something I saw in previous business, not here, somewhere else. The company I was working for did projects in Vietnam and somebody got and they drew three overriding circles or interlocking circles and tried to explain it that way. And, I'm sorry, I'm probably getting more dense as I get older, but I just don't understand where this is going, when the County has made such a commitment to open space, wildlife preservation, 97 percent federal land, which we hope is protected, conservation easements over 10,000, and I don't know exactly how many. I was a member of the three families who did the first nature conservancies in Wyoming at Skyline Ranch, four hundred dollars and 600 acres permanently preserved. I don't think we got anything out of it; we didn't have enough income to take a tax credit. But that's the history of this Valley. And I guess I don't want to say we shouldn't grow, but I will say the County shouldn't grow. We should split the County and the Town apart for purposes of long-range planning. The Town as Heart makes a lot of sense, but when you look at the implications of growth anywhere, and ultimately that's what happens right through the Village, it's easy to understand why WYDOT says, you've got to have the three lanes or five lanes. They project traffic 20 years in the future. Every projection that has been made in this County has been met or exceeded. There's no effort, no meaningful, serious effort by the planning entities, and again it's not you folks—it's the County Commissioners who have that authority to limit growth or control what happens. They were spending 80 percent on construction that was federal money; they have requirements that it meet certain standards. That's their job. They will do their job eventually. The second thing...and the third thing is the districts. And that's...15 districts is fine but the ones that make up the Town, Town as Heart are the important ones to consider more density. I don't know whether it should be there or not. We'll talk about that when you get to that point. But I urge you to try and take care of the County lands. Things Peter spoke to, there are not many properties left that have not been developed that would lend themselves to a large development where you would actually gain a conservation easement in exchange for density. So I would urge you to look carefully at the map and see what you're really talking about. You're clearly talking about the north end of South Park. That's been kicked down the road for 20 years, 30 years. And I'm not sure waiting for infill in Town is doing anything more than just delaying some definitive action that shows some limits. The timeline is another thing I would like to see, and I keep thinking these meetings are a chance that somebody is going to say that this is the deal and recommend it and the elected officials adopt it. But so far I don't have a sense of where we're going and when we're going to get there and I'd really like to have that. Thank you very much.

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	<p>Hi, I'm Becky Tillson, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. I wanted to start by thanking all of you guys for the enormous amount of time you've served the last couple of years. <<inaudible>>. So, thank you for all of that. Trevor covered earlier some of our most comprehensive ???. Those are also included in our written comments. I wanted to give just a couple of specific suggestions about the maps, district map on the ?? section. Overall, in the introduction, there needs to be a statement that clearly establishes the prioritization of wildlife and natural resources, which in this Plan is the well-documented will of the community. As we did for Buffalo Valley, it should be clear that choosing a goal of housing or workforce or whatever should not trump the top priority of wildlife protection. Also, in the introduction, the definition of conservation area should be clarified that we will not only be reducing impacts of development but actually the overall development potential in the area as well. And lastly—I think Greg mentioned this earlier—there needs to be a clear consideration of commercial development potential throughout the County ?? the need for housing and the amount and type of commercial development that works with ?? districts. Specific to the districts, there's just a couple of other things. In Districts #2 and 4, I think it would be important to clarify that Flat Creek enhancements are not only social but also <<inaudible>>. In District 2, we do agree that <<inaudible>>, but I just wanted to point out right now that we don't believe it's appropriate for the ?? to extend into District 4 unless it's really explicitly limited to existing nonconforming uses. District 5, <<inaudible>>. I think...I just wanted to make it clear that the idea is not to give an up zone in Northern South Park without first trying to do it elsewhere. It is a good idea to continue the discussion on linking development in this area to the growth management plan, and perhaps a solution maybe is to have linkage to the growth management plan include the caveat allowing for development that's associated with permanent open space protection ???. In District 6, I think I mentioned that it would be important to clarify that further subdivision should not be encouraged. District...the River Bottom District mentions ?? and I think that should be included in the Town and County Periphery districts as well. In #10, the wildlife corridors that was mentioned, that Rich was talking about, east/west, are important to point out. High-density development in the Aspens, which is an area with high wildlife values and existing road kill problems and transportation problems, as you all know, is not consistent with the goals of this Plan...high-density development in the Aspens is not consistent with the goals of the Plan. We don't know exactly how ?? is slated for that area, but it makes sense to really minimize that ???. In the Village, this new change that we've been talking about, about not increasing beyond the established footprint, we think it's a good idea, but we prefer to see the amount and type of that future growth. ?? development that will generate markets rather than ?? is really inappropriate. The balance of convenience commercial and workforce residential housing could be explored but only with some analysis of the <<inaudible>>. As we change the subdistrict lines, people should be able to maintain the rural character of that gateway area, preserving the rural character ?? really explicit having a change around the lines there. That's too much and I just wanted to thank you guys again for your years of service and ???. Thank you.</p>

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	<p>Gregory Griffith, West Bank. Five years, five hundred thousand dollars plus, 105 meetings plus. Are we really better off than we were five years ago? I say not. We've got so much of the big substantive discussions we need to have. We keep putting it off, we keep putting it off, it's at the next phase, it's at the next phase. Everyone pretty much acknowledges outside the ?? the psychology of the economy. I got into this process for one reason and one reason only, acknowledging that wildlife and open space. We can't have any substantive long-term beneficial or benefit to our wildlife without protecting more of the habitat they need to not only migrate but to move around on a daily fashion. We can't do that without permanent protection. This Plan is just completely turned on its ear from a permanent protection perspective. Everything hinged in early days on two issues primarily—affordable housing and the PRD, because without the clustering incentives, without some dedicated funding source, without a myriad or a mountain of some methodology to create this open space and to keep it...to perpetuate this little song of stewardship we have, everything else falls by the wayside. We can't do that without ?? Several people have spoken to this issue already. The ?? isn't about anything other than preventing the additive growth without having that ??, that nexus. To add to growth anywhere in the County cannot be achieved without permanent reduction elsewhere, or else we will end up essentially with the four horsemen of the overdevelopment apocalypse and that is density, sprawl, increased verticality, and the one nobody talks about, concentric expansion, which is exactly what's occurring now because they proposed expansion in the Aspens and in Northern South Park. It's absolutely ludicrous. I have a specific suggestion. I also count on Staff's numbers. It'd be nice if you guys would parse out the 4300 overage in the 6800 base entitlement and how that was arrived at. We were originally told the max PRD potential is 2900. I'd really like to see that parsed out, that number, that 4300 number that gets us to 11.1. A specific suggestion would be to eliminate...of the four categories, only have transitional and preservation. That's what people understand and most people think now that stable doesn't mean stable, it's simply the holding pattern for you'll be transitional next. So, if we're really serious about that, let's just have two categories—transitional and preservation. And that includes small town, community character, wildlife, scenic resources—the preservation of everything. There's been a stunning lack of acknowledgement throughout this process about amount of growth. Amount of growth is much more important in a constrained environment in which we live than location of growth. A lot of planners and architects, I understand all these principles as well as you guys do. I'd have that discussion with anybody in the room. In the constrained footprint that we're under, a lot of these new urbanistic and smart-growth principles have diminishing returns. That's not my opinion, that's actual data analysis. The quintessentially high and low development, sea of wilderness in public lands, assuredly as we're ??, we are constrained and islands have carrying capacities. They have carrying capacity both on qualitative and a quantitative standpoint, but we need to acknowledge that. The amount of growth is more important to the majority of the populace than location of growth. We should have adhered to the better-not-bigger premise and work with an existing footprint. Six point six million square feet, we're acknowledging a lack of critical thinking and critical problem-solving ability, if we can't work within that footprint. Six point six million square feet of commercial outstanding and 6800 base entitled units, especially in this economic time, we should be able to work within that footprint. There's also a lack of acknowledgement about the cost of growth. We keep projecting these growths, this growth and this growth pattern without considering a strong linkage to the cost of growth; most prominent among those are commercial and employee generation rates and our inability to house them where we want to, and that contribution to the commuter rate also should be considered.</p>

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	<p>I am hopefull that you will do right by the people of Jackson Hole who have worked hard to make this plan fair to all.</p> <p>Under Illustrating our Vision it states that "Realizing our vision means proactively planning for what we want – rural open spaces and high quality complete neighborhoods – and identifying where we want them. Our Vision and Common Values describe how we will direct development toward suitable areas in order to preserve and protect the ecosystem and design development to enhance our quality of life. The Illustration of Our Vision identifies where those suitable areas are located. As important as location, is the type of preservation or development desired. Unlike the past, a principle of growth management in this Plan is predictable implementation. By defining the desired character for each area of the community, all community members know what to expect as a result of preservation and development regulations and incentives. In areas suitable for development, the Illustration of Our Vision describes how we will protect the character we love while ensuring that the development contributes to the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. The Illustration of Our Vision also describes how we will preserve and enhance all other areas to provide wildlife habitat, wildlife connectivity, scenery, and open space. The community is committed to continually adapting our implementation strategies to ensure preservation and development occurs in the desired amount, location, and type. This can only be realized if we define desired location and character for the preservation and development. Adapting our implementation also requires rigorous analysis of our successes and failures. The Illustration of Our Vision defines existing, baseline character in addition to desired future character; allowing implementation strategies to be adapted based on analysis rather than theory. Our community's many districts share common values, but also have unique identities. While each of our community's policies is important to achieving our Vision, not all policies apply community wide. Each individual preservation and development project should be a contributing piece in the community wide plan for achieving our Vision. The Illustration of Our Vision is the community wide picture of where we will place all the pieces – ensuring that all policies of this Plan are implemented in the context of our Vision and no policies are forgotten."</p> <p>We can improve the district maps by including what our our community has always called for and has stated so in OUR vision above. If we don't, the latter part of the above which states that "allowing implementation strategies to be adapted based on analysis rather than theory" will be in fact the opposite. Without the projected growth numbers for each district and over all for town and county, we will be theorizing our way into a quagmire that only developers could love.</p> <p>Please focus on decreasing development in desirable areas rather than focusing on where growth should go. Focusing on just growth areas will lead to careless development planning and cost overruns that will hurt everyone. Also work with the Land Trust and large land owners by providing incentives to permanently retire development rights. The Land Trust is very important to the success of the comprehensive plan.</p>
		<p>Being from Cottonwood Park I would like to repeat the some of the recommendations that JHCA has submitted to the process.</p> <p>District 5: West Jackson</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Recommendation: Section 5.2 should be amended to recognize that this area is already trending towards housing and complete neighborhood attributes, and should be encouraged to continue to do so, given the close proximity to schools, a grocery store, pathways and Flat Creek. This is an ideal location for "complete neighborhood" attributes, but given recent developments, it is no longer a particularly good location for industrial uses. Industry should be focused into District 7.Recommendation: Section 5.4 should commit to repurposing High School Road primarily as a residential access road and not a highway.Recommendation: Section 5.6 needs to be clarified with regard to the lower priority of development in northwest South Park.

You can either ruin High School road with theories or go by the numbers. You can't have industrial growth and have a safe environment for school zones and the neighborhoods around them. Hopefully you read my letters in the past pushing for a campus road that promotes safety and less traffic on High School Road. It is so important now that the district map is calling for expansion of the school zone on High School Road. Please respect our wishes as property owners with rights too. We are not looking to make money off of it. We are just looking to preserve our land and it's value as a

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
1/24/2012 ,	Design Review Committ	<p>great family neighborhood.</p> <p>5.1 Highway Corridor: Encourage measures to marry curb cuts and create stronger street walls with landscaping. Broadway continues to be a true eyesore for most of its length; only by creating an environment that is more comfortable for pedestrians with better street walls, proportions, safety and landscaping, will it become a vital street.</p> <p>5.6 Northwest South Park: A traffic study to identifying the impact of an additional connector between HWY 89 and South Park Loop would be helpful in understanding the appearance and character of such a road.</p>
1/16/2012	Karns, Pete Interested Public	<p>One of the dowfalls of creating land use rules and regulations is the "law of unintended consequences". Unfortunately, we already have some unintended consequences as a result of the Plan that is currently in place.</p> <p>Every day there are hundreds of our Jackson Hole workforce that commute from Star Valley and Idaho to get to their jobs. These commuters waste hundreds of man hours while on the road. They burn thousands of gallons of fossil fuel.</p> <p>They create tons of CO2. Many of them have been seriously hurt in accidents getting to and from their jobs. Some have even died.</p> <p>I am sure that our planners did not create this scenario on purpose when they were creating the current land use plan. However, I do consider this a failure on their part not to foresee what was going to happen.</p> <p>The unfortunate thing is that many of these workforce people would not be making this commute if they could find rental housing in Jackson Hole. During the boom years leading up to the economic downturn in 2007, apartment projects had waiting lists and people with jobs had no choice but to go outside the valley to find housing. Today, the problem is not as bad but still exists.</p> <p>If there is such a large demand for apartments in Jackson Hole, then why hasn't the private sector stepped up and built more apartment buildings? The answer is simple. There is not a zoning district in our current plan that adequately provides for the building of apartments. The only zoning district where apartments are feasible also allows condominiums and townhouses in the same district. It is far more profitable to build condos and townhouses and therefore they win out over apartments. What'smore, even if a developer were to consider building apartments, the current zoning doesn't allow high enough density to make apartments economically feasible.</p> <p>There is a solution to this problem but it would take a major change in the direction that our planners are headed. The first step would be to create an entirely new zoning district in the Plan. This district, let's call it Workforce Housing, would need two major components. First, it would need to allow very high density multifamily housing. Secondly, it could not be subdivided. This would prevent it from being converted to condos at a later date. These two components would separate Workforce Housing from the current AR Residential zoning where condos and townhouses would continue to be built.</p> <p>These two components would also provide the opportunity and would carry the financial incentive for free enterprise to then step up and create the housing.</p> <p>The second step would be to find an area suitable to build such a project. I do not believe that there are any opportunities within the Town of Jackson to build such a project (except maybe the Rodeo Grounds if it were to be moved out of town). This leaves the north end of South Park as the next possibility. There may be other areas in the valley that could be considered.</p> <p>Some would say that building large apartment complexes in Jackson Hole would bring unwanted growth. I look at it differently. We would not be adding more people to the valley. Instead, we would be bringing home those people who already work here but are forced to live elsewhere. At the same time, we would be saving the environment, cutting back on pollution, reducing the use of fossil fuels, eliminating wasted man hours and possibly even saving lives. Let's get our workforce back in Jackson Hole where they belong.</p>

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
1/12/2012	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Alex and Bruce – I know you have the tapes etc., but following is my take on where the County landed on areas 5.6 and district 10 – let me know if I got it wrong. Area 5.6 <ul style="list-style-type: none">•In-fill first discussion – Outcome = the in-fill language stays.•PRD addition discussion on earlier “opportunities”<ul style="list-style-type: none">oOutcome = redraft in-fill section – “promote infill, leave open opportunities resulting in permanent conservation of open space via the PRD - if applications come before “in-fill” (Town and other complete neighborhoods) is accomplished.”❑Hank added “unique workforce housing opportunities” in addition to earlier consideration before in-fill occurs – but emphasis remains on permanent open space conservation - and workforce housing secondary.•Outcome = Paul V. said no on the housing addition suggested by Hank, I do not have in my notes of any other electeds agreeing with Hank (just Paul Dunker and Peter) – not sure where this ended?oUses in district – residential only – other? – Outcome = residential focus – but a “little bit” of mixed use.oNot sure where staff’s suggestion for discussion on: “Add vision for redundant streets, variety of housing types, wildlife permeability if developed”❑Outcome = These ideas were never discussed by the group according to my notes – and they are red changes.•Boundary of district – Outcome = no change
 Area 10.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Outcome = leave as written		
 Area 10.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Outcome = leave as written		
 Good luck the next few weeks compiling all of these “agreed” upon changes – along with what remains as written – plus your green changes.		

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
1/12/2012	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Alex and Bruce – I know Shawn took notes and you have the tapes, but following is my take on where the town landed on areas 5.6 and district 10 – let me know if I got it wrong. Area 5.6 <ul style="list-style-type: none">•EW connector (South Park Loop to HWY 89) –Tie to development of 5.6. Split on need, intersection with HWY 89 causing problems, whether it would encourage development....<ul style="list-style-type: none">oSummary conclusion = soften language and mention it as "one of several possibilities" for traffic challenges in the area if that area is developed.•High School road – Summary conclusions = strengthen language to focus more improvements for pedestrians safety, school zone, reduce speed limits, traffic calming etc. as traffic "will always go there"oBasically that HS road needs to be addressed as both the EW connector and Tribal trail connector will not solve the problems on HS road•Tribal trails connector – Summary conclusion = no changes in language – leave as is•Timing of considering 5.6 for development –<ul style="list-style-type: none">o"Infill first" language should be considered in all new areas (Mark O) – unsure that was generally agreed to or not?oTie are to growth management plan, urban growth boundary – all generally concurredoClarify "if necessary" language – make firm, defined, conditional - MelissaoClarify density - not just "adjacent neighborhoods" – which neighborhoods, Cottonwood Park or Ellenwood (Barbara)oSummary conclusion of Bruce = "tighten it up more, tie to growth management plan"
<p>Area 10.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Summary conclusion = leave as written		
<p>Area 10.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Summary conclusion = leave as written – let the County review•Bob's comment – connectivity between subdivisions language "too aggressive" – not sure where that conversation ended?		
<p>Misunderstandings I noticed:</p> <p>Things I learned that you should consider in your introduction to the County group this afternoon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Clarify that all growth management goals are met in the identified transition areas while seeking conservation/preservation of the identified rural areas.oThat an important portion of the plan is to stay within "no more than twice the build environment"•Radio grounds – current location is committed under a 24 year lease to the fair board.•That the Tribal Trails connector and the east-west connector in area 5.6 are two different road sections.oThat there is an easement for Tribal Trails but not one for the theoretical east-west connector in area 5.6.•That the unmapped existing wildlife movement corridors east-west and north-south (apart from the identified Flat Creek corridor that you did map in areas 10.1 and 10.2) is causing some confusion (I know this is a green change I have pointed out – but the current missing wildlife corridors did influence the 10.2 discussion).		
<p>Items of importance to staff that were never brought up for discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•You never brought to discussion in 5.6 two red items of staff that should be discussed with the County:<ul style="list-style-type: none">o"Add allowance for location of PRD development"o"Add vision for redundant streets, variety of housing types, wildlife permeability if developed"		

6: Town Periphery

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	<p>Hi, I'm Becky Tillson, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. I wanted to start by thanking all of you guys for the enormous amount of time you've served the last couple of years. <<inaudible>>. So, thank you for all of that. Trevor covered earlier some of our most comprehensive ???. Those are also included in our written comments. I wanted to give just a couple of specific suggestions about the maps, district map on the ?? section. Overall, in the introduction, there needs to be a statement that clearly establishes the prioritization of wildlife and natural resources, which in this Plan is the well-documented will of the community. As we did for Buffalo Valley, it should be clear that choosing a goal of housing or workforce or whatever should not trump the top priority of wildlife protection. Also, in the introduction, the definition of conservation area should be clarified that we will not only be reducing impacts of development but actually the overall development potential in the area as well. And lastly—I think Greg mentioned this earlier—there needs to be a clear consideration of commercial development potential throughout the County ?? the need for housing and the amount and type of commercial development that works with ?? districts. Specific to the districts, there's just a couple of other things. In Districts #2 and 4, I think it would be important to clarify that Flat Creek enhancements are not only social but also <<inaudible>>. In District 2, we do agree that <<inaudible>>, but I just wanted to point out right now that we don't believe it's appropriate for the ?? to extend into District 4 unless it's really explicitly limited to existing nonconforming uses. District 5, <<inaudible>>. I think...I just wanted to make it clear that the idea is not to give an up zone in Northern South Park without first trying to do it elsewhere. It is a good idea to continue the discussion on linking development in this area to the growth management plan, and perhaps a solution maybe is to have linkage to the growth management plan include the caveat allowing for development that's associated with permanent open space protection ???. In District 6, I think I mentioned that it would be important to clarify that further subdivision should not be encouraged. District...the River Bottom District mentions ?? and I think that should be included in the Town and County Periphery districts as well. In #10, the wildlife corridors that was mentioned, that Rich was talking about, east/west, are important to point out. High-density development in the Aspens, which is an area with high wildlife values and existing road kill problems and transportation problems, as you all know, is not consistent with the goals of this Plan...high-density development in the Aspens is not consistent with the goals of the Plan. We don't know exactly how ?? is slated for that area, but it makes sense to really minimize that ???. In the Village, this new change that we've been talking about, about not increasing beyond the established footprint, we think it's a good idea, but we prefer to see the amount and type of that future growth. ?? development that will generate markets rather than ?? is really inappropriate. The balance of convenience commercial and workforce residential housing could be explored but only with some analysis of the <<inaudible>>. As we change the subdistrict lines, people should be able to maintain the rural character of that gateway area, preserving the rural character ?? really explicit having a change around the lines there. That's too much and I just wanted to thank you guys again for your years of service and ???. Thank you.</p>

6: Town Periphery

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	<p>Thank you for letting us give another public comment in this process. My name is Patty Ewing...excuse me, I'm a little horse. I've lived in Jackson for quite awhile and I'm focusing...during this whole process, I had great hopes that the planning work plan would be revised, not fully rewritten. And my general feeling is to echo much of what has already been said. But I want to limit my comments to East Jackson, to the Town Periphery, District 6, and I have written a letter, or we have a letter that was submitted on December 3rd, and you may or may not have read this in your public comment, but I'd like to read it to you now. And this was addressed to the electeds. This letter documents the future character of the Town Periphery district which we, the undersigned, desire and expect. We have used simple language to make comparison with the forthcoming land-use Regulations straightforward. The Town Periphery is a low-density residential neighborhood which borders the undeveloped public lands of the National Forest and the Elk Refuge. It is not unusual to see deer, fox, moose, ?? in our yards. It is a quiet neighborhood with large yards and open views of the mountains. We want it to stay that way. We ask that you design land-use regulations which are predictable and preserve our existing neighborhood character and we look forward to the review of your efforts in the coming months. And these are the things that we asked for on December 3rd: large lots (at least a minimum of 1/3 of an acre); more open space than structures; permeable to wildlife; Planned Unit Development subdivision not allowed, such high density is not compatible; properly maintain the Cache Creek Drive, do not make it a complete street like Redmond is; horses will continue to be allowed; and no new commercial enterprises are needed or desired. And I will submit copies of that letter signed by property owners in the Cache Creek, Snow King Estate, and Upper Cache Creek area. We so far don't have all of them, except the few we could get. But my cover letter is here and I'll just make one copy of all of these; I'm assuming you can make copies if you like. And this is addressed to those of you who are the members of this Joint Planning Commission. Please include copies of the attached letters dated December 3rd of 2011 with additional signatures, all property owners in the Cache Creek and Upper Cache Creek areas. The original letter was submitted to be a part of the public comment for the Comprehensive Plan on December 3rd. This letter supports, for the most part, the future desired characteristics of District 6, as published by the Town and County planners on December 7th. We appreciate the recognition by the planners of the importance to retain a part of the Town of Jackson as only single-family units with larger lots, and the recognition of the importance of the permeability of wildlife. We will continue this effort to obtain more signatures and at that point we'll submit those later. So, if you don't mind, I'll submit this and you all can make copies. There will be more signatures coming. Thank you.</p>

7: South Highway 89

Date	Name	Comment
2/28/2012	Ross, Slade Interested Public	I am surprised to see this called "Our Vision" when those of us who live in this district have not been listened to! My family is one of the largest landowners in this area and thus we will be impacted substantially by these "visions" which are not ours. This area is one of the last and best places for more complete neighborhoods. If we were allowed to have some conveniences in this neighborhood, it would reduce fuel usage, animal/vehicle incursions and allow the working people of this county a place to live and work. This plan is too restrictive and needs to be expanded. The scenic overlay also needs to be removed! This is one of the least scenic areas, especially on the west side of the highway in 7.2. This plan completely ignores the uses already in place!
2/22/2012	Ross, Dianna Interested Public	I HAVE READ AND RE-READ THE CHARACTER DISTRICTS AND STILL DO NOT KNOW WHAT THEY MEAN FOR US. CAN YOU GIVE ME SOME IDEA OF WHAT IS GOING TO BE ALLOWED ON OUR PROPERTY?
1/30/2012	Ross, Dianna Interested Public	I HAVE ATTENDED A LOT OF THE PLANNING MEETINGS AND STILL DO NOT KNOW WHAT ALL OF THIS MEANS FOR OUR PROPERTY. WE STILL HAVE PEOPLE INTERESTED IN BUYING TO ESTABLISH CONSTRUCTION YARDS. IS THIS SOMETHING THAT CAN BE DONE ON OUR PROPERTY UNDER THE NEW DISTRICTS? I REALLY WOULD LIKE TO BE ABLE TO SELL SOMETHING AS LANE AND I HAVE BOTH HAD MAJOR HEALTH PROBLEMS IN THE LAST FEW YEARS. I MYSELF HAVE HAD 5 MAJOR SURGERIES IN THE LAST 18 MONTHS. IF YOU CAN HELP PLEASE LET ME KNOW.

8: River Bottom

Date	Name	Comment
3/9/2012	Hubbard, A.C. & Penne Interested Public	We are in complete agreement with Mr. Hoke and hope you take this into consideration.
3/9/2012	Taylor, Ken HOA: Crescent H	<p>I am writing out of concern for certain language regarding the Character Districts in the Comprehensive Plan Illustration of Our Vision. The Crescent H Ranch appears to be in District 8.2 and District 11.4 with some of the mountain properties outside of the designated Character Districts, and I am alarmed with the language that seems to allow for future changes to our existing development regulations.</p> <p>Addressing Character District 8.2, Page IV-51 states:</p> <p>"Development potential will be directed out of this district and efforts to reduce the impact of development on wildlife such as limiting house size and fencing will be implemented."</p> <p>It further states that "Redevelopment efforts will be focused on reducing the amount and impact of development."</p> <p>Page IV-53 states:</p> <p>"Non-development conservation is the preferred land use in this area."</p> <p>"Development potential in this area should be directed into Complete Neighborhoods or clustered....."</p> <p>"Development that does occur will include small structures and limited disturbance....."</p> <p>How these efforts could or would be applied to Crescent H Ranch or to other existing properties in Character District 8 is at best unclear and potentially very troubling.</p> <p>While I wholeheartedly support the preservation of our county's wildlife, our wildlife habitat and our open spaces, at Crescent H Ranch our development is managed to promote those initiatives.</p> <p>I also understand the need to preserve and conserve the yet to be developed open spaces and rural areas- areas that are not currently platted or planned for development.</p> <p>However, any effort to re-regulate, re-configure or re-develop existing, permitted and platted properties will be very strongly opposed.</p> <p>In summary, I am very concerned that the Character District plan is unclear in its intent and can easily be interpreted to be an overreaching approach by the county to control the nature of development in the valley through future regulatory changes affecting both undeveloped areas and areas that are currently platted and developed as subdivisions or single private properties.</p>

8: River Bottom

Date	Name	Comment
3/7/2012	Fenn, Jon Interested Public	<p>What a long strange trip it has been to get to where we are with the Comprehensive Plan (CP). From the start, the community made it clear that the priorities should be open space and wildlife habitat. Now we have a proposed new CP that provides for increasing density in certain areas without creating binding commitments that will permanently decrease density in other areas. I would urge you to vote against the proposed CP since it does not commit to permanently decreased density in high priority conservation areas to offset the areas of increased density.</p> <p>The proposed CP is ambiguous and not specific enough with regards to how density will be reduced in hi-priority conservation areas. Given the historical pattern of development in the County and how political the development approval process is in Jackson, the CP needs to be crystal clear with regards to exactly what (how much in terms of exact #s) density will be permitted in what areas.</p> <p>This lack of clarity is particularly noteworthy in Section 8.1 of the Illustrations of Our Vision (IOV) which sets forth how District 8 would be viewed under the new CP. I was surprised to learn that Wilderness Ranch, where we live, isn't included in this description while some of the surrounding subdivisions (John Dodge, Tucker, Linn Ranch) are included. The IOV goes on to say that the goal is to RECLAIM as much open space as possible. Please think about the practicality of reclaiming developed land in subdivisions. I would urge you to think in realistic terms and focus on permanently protecting existing open space and not waste tax dollars on trying to reclaim subdivided land. Then Section 8.1 goes on to speak of increasing public access to the Snake River in this area. How is increasing public access (i.e. foot, dog, & skier traffic) along the Snake River going to help wildlife? By having contradictory objectives and ambiguous language in the proposed CP, the commissioners are opening the door to various competing interpretations. This means politics and a very cumbersome bureaucratic process will rule the day as future decision makers wrestle with the lack of clarity in the CP.</p> <p>To satisfy the community priorities of wildlife habitat and open space the CP must have specific binding mechanisms that tie any increased density rights, above the current base level, to permanent conservation through less density in other areas. Unfortunately, for any such mechanism to work effectively and create some degree of certainty for planners, homeowners and developers, it has to quantify the amount of development (how much in terms of exact numbers and exact densities) that will be permitted. This is the only way that the tradeoffs can be assessed accurately and not be left to the interpretation of parties with conflicting interests.</p> <p>I am urging you to vote against the CP unless the language is changed to address the issues noted above. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>I fully agree with the content of Bland Hoke Jr. letter to you dated February 29. This is the last and worst example of superficial behavior by the Board. I believe we should expect a more by our elected politicians.</p>
3/6/2012	Lyons, Fred and Dee Interested Public	<p>As residents of Lake Creek Ranch and former residents of John Dodge, we are extremely concerned with Section 8.1 of the Comp Plan...We respectfully request that the current language of Section 8.1 be replaced with totally rewritten language clarifying that at no time for any reason will the rights of property owners of District 8 be compromised by any such plan. The current language puts us at risk of future imposition. Certainly both of our residences in these areas were specifically oriented to wildlife habitat through stringent building codes.</p>
3/6/2012	Smith, Barbara Interested Public	<p>Sirs...I am deeply disturbed by descriptions and conclusions of Section 8 of the plan. As a layman I find the word confusing and unclear and frankly end with no idea of what is intended or what this plan might mean. I would encourage broader and more complete definitions and a discussion with all those impacted by the plan. It seems to have been developed in stealth without the usual discussion and inclusion of the parties most affected. I am total support of the comments mentioned in the letter to you from G Bland Hoke.</p>

8: River Bottom

Date	Name	Comment
3/1/2012	Frisbie, Becky Interested Public	<p>I am writing you with concerns I have about some of the verbage in the Illustrations of Vision. After having Hank and Paul Vogelheim at our office meeting yesterday morning, Hank felt an email to you would be justified.</p> <p>First, one point that was brought to everyone's attention is the phrase "workforce housing" which prevails throughout. What exactly is "workforce housing"? I and many others, feel this needs to be specifically clarified as it can be construed many ways. One, for example, could say our home in John Dodge is "workforce housing" as both Tom and I work. I doubt this is the case, but a specific definition needs to be included so everyone is on the same page.</p> <p>Secondly, the next area of concern is in Character Defining Features of the area 8 which includes John Dodge. Most specifically stated as ..."This Conservation Area is characterized by an exiting built form that will become less impactful to wildlife in the future. Subdivision and new development is not appropriate in this area. Redevelopment will result in a reduction of the number and size of buildings, elimination or reduction of fencing, clustering of buildings among exisiting lots, buffering of waterbodies and wetlands, and other methods of reducing the human impact on wildlife habitat. The goal of this area is to reclaim as much open space and natural landscape for wildlife as possible. Where additional public access is achieved in this area it will be managed to protect wildlife viability." To me, this verbage leaves it very open to many ways of interpretation, including not allowing a lot to be developed or redeveloped! This is quite frightening to me as I feel I live in a wonderful area that has been developed with both wildlife and humanlife in mind. We must not forget that the plan is for the humanlife and making development responsible in a way that allows all creatures to live together!</p> <p>Please remove this sort of verbage as I think it is detrimental to the process.</p> <p>I think the plan should be concerned with the parcels of land throughout the valley that have not been developed and those which have been developed responsibly should be left alone.</p> <p>Thanks for your consideration and I would appreciate a response.</p>

8: River Bottom

Date	Name	Comment
2/29/2012	Hoke, Bland, Jr. Interested Public	<p>In reviewing the Illustrations of Our Vision (IOV) I have taken note of Section 8.1. This sets forth the planners' vision of what they would like to implement in the District 8 area, specifically calling out the residential areas of John Dodge, Tucker Ranch, Linn Ranch and Solitude. The language in the paragraph states:</p> <p>'This CONSERVATION subarea is characterized by single family homes on multiple acres adjacent to the Snake River. While this subarea is largely developed, it is increasingly inhabited by wildlife. The goal of this subarea is to reclaim as much open space and natural landscape for wildlife habitat and movement as possible while respecting existing property rights. The built form should become less impactful to wildlife in the future. Subdivision and new development is not desired and incentives to reduce density and human impacts on wildlife habitat through redevelopment should be explored. Additional public access to the Snake River should be designed and managed to protect wildlife viability.'</p> <p>First, OMISSION? Why does Section 8.1 only reference John Dodge, Tucker, Linn and Solitude? According to the map, District 8 includes the following subdivisions and land parcels: RLazy SSubdivision, Yodeler, Lake Creek Ranch, Rocking H, John Dodge, Homestead, Wilderness Ranch, Tucker Ranch, River Springs, River Hollow, Pine Meadow, Wildwood, Teal Trace, Crescent H, Fish Creek Meadow, Eagle South fork, River Meadows, Ely Springs, San Rodo Ranch, Indian Springs, Bar-B-C, Bar-B-Bar, Bear Island, Woodside, Snake River Woods, KKR Ranch, Solitude, Owl Creek, and North Meadow subdivision. Why are these areas not mentioned?</p> <p>Second, CONTRADICTION? Is the goal for wildlife habitat not already being achieved in this friendly habitat? Your document's words: "While this subarea is largely developed, it is increasingly inhabited by wildlife." Even more puzzling: "Additional public access to the Snake River should be designed and managed to protect wildlife viability." Yes, additional people and lots of loose dogs certainly enhance the wildlife experience. Is there any doubt the County can successfully design and manage the impact?</p> <p>Third, PROTECTION? I am not sure that I fully understand what the planners have in mind. In studying this language it would appear that they envision adopting new regulations that would change these neighborhoods in ways that no one, except the planners, has ever contemplated. What they clearly imply is that for any land use application in District 8, they will insist that homes be downsized, clustered or, in the worst case, removed -- all in the name of protecting wildlife. This is just ridiculous and frightening.</p> <p>When the County and Town embarked on this new plan, I do not believe there was ever any input from citizens in all of these residential communities that would have given a shred of credence to the planners to justify proposing these radical actions for solidly established neighborhoods.</p> <p>In addressing the John Dodge Subdivisions specifically, these parcels have been developed over forty years with some of the strictest covenants in the county -- small building envelopes, restrictive fencing requirements, limited domestic animals - all for the purpose of wildlife protection and quality of environment. People have bought and built on their lots with the peace of mind that they know how the neighborhood will look, now and in the future. I can't conceive of what the planners could dictate to make this area "less impactful to wildlife" and find "incentives to reduce density and human impacts" except to forbid any redevelopment and remove the human element entirely. This would support the planners' axiom: "Subdivision and new development is not desired".</p> <p>If this is the direction the Commissioners are willing to bless and authorize, then Nelly Bar the Door. Our community will really have something to discuss.</p> <p>CONCLUSION:</p> <p>I respectfully request that the current language be replaced with language that states that existing neighborhoods within District 8 will be considered "stable" areas. Either remove the specific reference to John Dodge, Tucker Ranch, Linn Ranch and Solitude or put in all of the names of the residential areas in District 8, including the unplatte but developed areas.</p> <p>Finally, clarify the intent of the wording in Section 8.1. As it now stands it is vague, contradictory and ambiguous at best. At worst, it leaves the door wide open for homeowner uncertainty and bureaucratic mischief.</p>

8: River Bottom

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Spitzer, Horton Interested Public	<p>My name is Horton Spitzer. I see very few...I'm from Wilson...I see very few familiar faces. At the last Comprehensive Plan meetings, Rich beat me—my wife and I attended a hundred meetings. You haven't seen me because I felt very frustrated. Everybody worked very hard on these and within months of that being accepted, there were variations, there was a lot of jams with developers, some with projects that had merit that went for years. This cost us money. This cost the community I think a great deal of lost patience. I suggest that everybody has their day in court, but if you don't have something in the Plan that says you're given so much time to present a plan, it may require a variation of some sort, a variance, and okay. But I think something should be considered that you get so many hearings, depending upon the size of the project. Once you pass that, when you come in the next time, [fist knocking] 10,000 bucks there and we'll hear you. You go back a second time, [fist knocking] 25,000. We have fallen prey to developing and they wear you down. They wear the public down. They wear the Planners down, the Commissioners. And it's I think a flaw. And we get run by the developers. I'm not saying we shouldn't develop, but I think the rules should be firm. I'm not going to name the projects. You know them, the ones that went on for years. I want to...end of that subject. And, lastly, I want to thank you for the consideration you've given on the West Bank along the Village Road based upon the feeling that wildlife is our major business now. It's not construction. It's not manufacturing, obviously. It's people come here to see the wildlife. I live in John Dodge and I think that whole corridor is precious. We never had elk migrating through our property but starting at C-Bar-V, the past two years, to wake up in the morning and find 40 or 50 elk bedded down in your yard is common. I've seen migrations of a hundred animals moving through the property. Why that's happened, I'm not prepared to say, but I think the migration route has changed, so we do have a heavy migration going through that part of our County. And I hope that's taken into consideration when a development is considered. Thanks for your job, you did a good job. And I do know Mike over here and it's good to see a familiar face, but let's not go through what we did before. Let's learn from our past and figure out how do we keep the Plan you've worked so hard for, whether we agree with it or not, from being a Ping-Pong ball when it comes to, oh, here's just another variance. Thank you.</p>

9: County Valley

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Smith, Bill Interested Public	<p>Hi, I'm Bill Smith. I'll start with almost an apology that I've only dug into the planning documents strenuously in about the last two weeks. I've absorbed as much as I can. You, of course, are very conversant with them; I am not. I live in Character District 9 and as I read and reread the text there about Character District 9, I'll say that things were a bit ambiguous to me. There was little there that I could really say, YES, or NO, to, you know, it was...and also there was a table in there, and I saw other comments about this, that had, you know, solid bullets and half bullets and things like that in the table and, to be honest with you, I couldn't make sense of that. I didn't understand what that was trying to say to me. If it said, you know, there were bullets that said this is the way Character District 9 is right now and bullets that, you know, mark certain intersections and that kind of thing, and then a separate table that said this is the way we're planning it to be with also bullets and proper intersections and that kind of thing, that would have made some sense to me. But I couldn't discern whether the table that was there was showing me the way it is right now or the way that you would like to plan it to be. Unclear. And that was a general comment about the way this is drafted at this point. To the average reader like me, and I consider myself a decent litmus test, not really easy to read and interpret. The use of acronyms and things like that as well, I would encourage you to, you know, my question, what is a PRD and that kind of thing, go ahead and spell them out. If these are intended to be, again, reviewed by the public, then don't use a lot of acronyms and jargon that the average reader will not understand. Now, that said, the PDF that you sent out, the packet, or what was on the website there, I perused that pretty carefully and of course most of the content was a compendium of written documents or written comments that had come in, apparently at the January 26th meeting, is that true? And again my earlier question, apparently those comments have not been interpreted nor incorporated into anything that is available to me yet. So, for us making comments tonight, we're kind of behind the eight-ball to start with in the sense that we're not seeing the latest and greatest version of the documents. And again a comment for the future, if you do, you know, want public to comment and that kind of thing, take pains to give us the latest and greatest so we can see where it stands right now, not, uh, we'll get this stuff into it later, you know, that kind of thing. The...tonight of course there will be more public comments that are going to be gathered, including mine, and likewise those are not going to get into the documents tonight obviously and yet immediately following this meeting, apparently there's a vote of some kind to approve the documents as is. To me that feels strange that there's an approval of something before it's in a final form or a final draft form at least. It seems like there ought to be, you know, one feedback loop rather than a rush to vote tonight. I think we all agree that intelligent planning is a good idea as long as it's done fairly and competently and in keeping with constitutionally limited government. And as I read the documents, of course that was my first reaction about is the government sticking its horns too far into the rights of citizens to control and to use their property. The...neither the...well, the U.S. Constitution, the Fifth Amendment, protects property rights of people who own property. And things like requirements on the part of any government, local or whatever, that say you can't use a certain proportion of your property, or whatever, folks, it's a taking of the rights of that property owner. There's just no two ways about it. And if you say, Bill, you've got to reserve 80 percent of your property for an elk migration corridor, personally, I love elk. I've got elk all over my property, no problem whatsoever. On the other hand, why should I pay 100 percent tax, property tax, on that property when I can't even use 80 percent of it? So, it feels like, you know, if we're going to play that game of putting restrictions on property use, then somebody's got to pay the price of that and it shouldn't be the property owner. I'm giving up already. Oh, I'm sorry. Last couple of comments here. This planning process, I'm aware that it does proceed from general to more and more specific and more and more stringent, if you will, in terms of ultimately we're going to get building codes and ordinances and that kind of thing that are all going to come out of this. And, you know, there is some nervousness on my part about that. Already today we have a UN drafted, drafted by bureaucrats of the United Nations, an International Energy Conservation Code governing what we can do here in Teton County Wyoming, folks. And I'm saying if you observe what the UN does around the world, I'm saying, why is this in my backyard? Why is Bill Smith being governed by a document that was ultimately drafted, or initially drafted by the United Nations, or a bunch of bureaucrats in the United Nations? Aren't we smart enough to come up with building codes that are particular and right and correct for the place where we live? If that's where this is heading, I think you're going to get more and more headwind from me and a lot of other people like me that are saying, wait a second, what is the UN doing in my backyard specifying the building code? I think that's it. Thank you.</p>

9: County Valley

Date	Name	Comment
1/31/2012	Scott, Mary Gibson Grand Teton National P	<p>In June 2011, the Teton County Board of Commissioners and the Jackson Town Council formally adopted the Jackson - Teton County Comprehensive Plan. This action was the result of years of hard work by you, your staff, and many others, and we appreciated the opportunity to provide our own comments on issues relevant to Grand Teton National Park. We commend you on this important achievement and are pleased that the Plan includes numerous references to the importance of coordinating with local federal land managers.</p> <p>While the Comprehensive Plan identified common values, principles, policies, and strategies for achieving the communities' goals, the next step is to identify more specifically how development will be directed in particular areas. The Illustration of Our Vision phase that is currently underway therefore seeks to define the character of 15 individual districts within the Town of Jackson and Teton County. We have reviewed the draft Illustration of Our Vision document and found that it is consistent with and respectful of the resources and values of Grand Teton National Park. We are particularly appreciative of efforts to maintain wildlife movement corridors in areas where it is appropriate to do so.</p> <p>As you continue moving forward with the planning effort, and in other related efforts such as revising the Natural Resources Overlay and the land development regulations, we ask that you continue to be mindful of the potential effects of decisions on Grand Teton National Park. Development on the west side of the Snake River along the Wyoming 390 corridor (Teton Village, Aspens, and Wilson) is of particular importance because of the potential to adversely affect the Moose - Wilson Road corridor within the park. This corridor contains some of the most rich and sensitive wildlife habitat within Grand Teton National Park, and is highly valued for its primitive values, opportunities for wildlife viewing, and access to the Laurance S. Rockefeller Preserve. The rustic, narrow, and winding character of the Moose - Wilson Road, and the relatively slow travel speeds are key to enjoyment of this area. Traffic volumes, however, are rapidly approaching levels that will diminish the quality of visitors' experience, and are likely not sustainable. Future growth on the Wyoming 390 corridor, as well as transportationrelated actions may significantly impact the park and should be carefully considered by planners and decision makers.</p> <p>We also note that Character District 15, the County Periphery, includes agricultural lands and open space that are adjacent to or within the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park. We appreciate that the draft Illustration of Our Vision document states that the areas within the County periphery will remain rural in character, that open space will be preserved, and wildlife habitat and movement corridors will be protected and enhanced. These policies, along with the criteria describing development in the Buffalo Valley and Kelly areas are consistent with NPS goals for management of adjacent park lands. As the planning process continues to move forward, we would appreciate the opportunity to provide input on how the land development regulations and Natural Resource Overlay can be used as tools for protecting park resources and values where development on inholdings or adjacent lands is a concern.</p> <p>We appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments and look forward to continued coordination on planning and development decisions that have cross-boundary implications. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please feel free to contact me or Management Assistant Gary Pollock at (307) 739-3411 or 739-3428.</p>

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
3/7/2012	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	As a property owner in both Big Trails subdivision and South Park subdivision I totally oppose the idea of interconnectivity and vehicular road access between subdivisions in South Park. The roads in Melody Ranch, Rafter J, South Park Ranches, Big Trails and South Park are all PRIVATE roads. Please change the language involving connectivity in the new comprehensive plan, district 10. I find it offensive as do others.
3/6/2012	McGregor, Bob and Kim Interested Public	Please be aware that we, as 16-year residents(owners) of property in South Park Ranches, oppose any attempts to connect our subdivision with any others, either in existence now or proposed in the future. Clarification in the language of anything passed by you-all would be helpful since we doubt that anyone else would be in favor of it either. Increased traffic in our quiet neighborhood is not something any who lives here would relish; after all, most of us live here because it's quiet and peaceful. Though we cannot speak for our neighbors we are letting you know our thoughts and hope you take them into consideration in formulating clear, concise language. Our property values, along with everyone else's, would most assuredly be affected in a negative way. No one would want this.

Thanks for listening, and please pass this on to the Jackson Town Council and Teton County Planning Commission, since I don't have their addresses.

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
2/29/2012	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	<p>the maps for character district 10 in the latest draft just released have left out mapping the extensive pathways in Melody Ranch whose access easements were granted to the County long ago and finally recorded by the County against all homeowner's properties in 2010. Most of these pathways were completed over ten years ago.</p> <p>These pathway easements were conveyed to the County (who never recorded them until 2010) in 2001 and 2006 by the developer. All of these sections were constructed long ago. One easement was also conveyed in 2008 upon releasing the developer from all future pathway obligations – this included the one unbuilt section along the north side of South Park Loop road (SPLR) in the western section and a small unbuilt connector piece from an existing pathway which brings the total pathway connections to SPLR to three.</p> <p>I note staff's legend says the mapping is based on the Pathways Master Plan of 2007. Since these maps show both built and to-be-built pathways - I fail to understand why the pathways (which are public) were not mapped in the recent character map release? Given that our HOA board has made certain arguments to the joint electeds on the wording of "interconnectivity" being constrained to non-motorized pathway connections – I would hope you can clarify staff's error to the joint electeds as they reconvene on March 14.</p> <p>I have copied Brian Schilling as he has the most current mapping. Brian I am sure can go over all of these pathways and easements with planning staff if there is any confusion.</p> <p>Again 90% of the pathways are built with two unbuilt pathway easements granted – one redundant section along South Park Loop road (SPLR) in the western half of the subdivision - and one additional short connector to SPLR from an existing pathway - making the southern connections to the SPL road a total of three – two in the west and one in the east. Of note there is also a public pathway easement across the agricultural open space that traverses Flat Creek between our two housing areas recorded at the same time (2010) conveyed to the County by the owner Paul Von Gontard. That is not noted in the attachment as that is not the HOA's property – it was built many years ago.</p> <p>In summary I want to emphasize that the pathway easements already granted - and not mapped on the recent character maps: connect the entire subdivision (pathways completed), stub out to the north in the western section (pathway completed), and in three locations (two completed) connect to South Park Loop road in the south on both sides (east and west of Flat Creek) of our subdivision. In addition the pathways (pathways completed) run continuously to the local convenience along HWY 89 - completing our connectivity via pathways to those amenities.</p> <p>Please clarify staff's oversight in not mapping the various extensive built public pathways and easements in Melody Ranch to the joint electeds before March 14 since our HOA has made a specific request for changes to the map language on interconnectivity that relate to these pathway systems. I have copied the joint electeds on this message.</p> <p>I am sure this is just an oversight given the complexity of the maps and volume of work - but the correct mapping is crucial to the joint electeds understanding our repeated requests to them on constraining interconnectivity in district 10 to non-motorized pathways.</p>

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
2/28/2012	Salter, Andy Interested Public	<p>I have just reviewed the "Illustration of Our Vision" document posted late last week on the Comprehensive Plan website. While I have a number of concerns about various aspects of your latest effort to revise the Town of Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan, I wish to highlight one area of particular concern. Regrettably, the concept of encouraging 'connectivity' between subdivisions remains in your draft plan despite numerous critical comments during this lengthy process from me, from my neighbors and from various Homeowner's Associations in South Park. Your latest draft still speaks obliquely about a goal of 'connectivity,' and in particular, in Policy 7.3a of "transportation connectivity." Section 10.1, defining the features of Southern South Park, states: "In the future, residents should be able to travel between existing subdivisions and access nonresidential amenities on the highway WITHOUT USING THE HIGHWAY OR SOUTH PARK LOOP RPAD." (Emphasis added.)</p> <p>Once again, I urge you to remove ALL references in this plan that urge or suggest an 'interconnection' be developed between subdivisions in South Park such as Rafter J and Melody Ranch. While the general concept of walking pathway interconnections may well be appropriate in the Plan where technically feasible and legally permissible, I and my neighbors in Melody Ranch are vehemently opposed to applying the concept to these two established neighborhoods in the form of a roadway connection. Doing so would ignore the established wishes of the residents of South Park and would unlawfully ignore established property rights. I continue to strongly believe this concept to be an unworkable, divisive and unrealistic goal. It would require a very costly, questionable and controversial "taking" of private property and recreational open space. It also certainly invite costly and protracted litigation.</p> <p>The Melody Ranch Homeowners Association already conveyed to the County a non-vehicle access easement to our pathway system with connections both on the north and south for any future pathway connectivity. A fundamental premise of the revised plan from its inception, as I understand Commissioner Phibbs to have continually emphasized, has been to respect existing private property rights. Broad and vague "connectivity" language does not accomplish and indeed flies in the face of that goal.</p> <p>As I have consistently advised you in my written comments, I sincerely appreciate your efforts to preserve and protect the unique and special qualities that have drawn all of us to Jackson Hole and that has drawn my neighbors and my family to South Park. Where ever it has come from, please strike the roadway connectivity concept from the final version the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
2/22/2012 ,	HOA: Melody Ranch	<p>Unclear and Problematic Character Map Language for District 10 - South Park:</p> <p>In the introduction of the character district maps for area 10 (South Park) the following phrase occurs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• "Future character will also include improved interconnectivity and internal connection to the commercial amenities along the highway. " <p>In the written description for sub-area 0.1 - Southern South Park - the following phrase occurs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• "Residents will be able to travel between existing subdivisions and access nonresidential amenities on the highway without using the highway or South Park Loop Road. " <p>On the map for this district a very large circle in Southern South Park is placed - the legend indicates this circle to represent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• "Increased Interconnectivity" <p>Melody DOA Request for Change:</p> <p>The Melody Ranch HOA board, on behalf of its membership, once again requests that these three sections be clarified so that interconnectivity clearly is identified as non-motorized pathway, and not vehicular road, interconnectivity.</p> <p>Rationale for Change Request:</p> <p>Our board submitted verbal and written comments in June 2011 to change the language to clarify that pathways are more suitable than roads to achieve interconnection between the various neighborhoods in Southern South Park. In addition last June two members of our HOA legal subcommittee, Marv Heileson and Andy Salter, also delivered public comment on this issue.</p> <p>Our HOA board supports the premise from a design standpoint, of having new subdivision roadways interconnected. A premise of the plan though was to respect existing private property rights. Our concern is from a legal perspective - does the County intend to put as a policy goal a contemplated action that would require eminent domain takings and condemnation?</p> <p>The Melody Ranch HOA has opposed in the past any takings to achieve road connectivity going back to Teton Meadows Ranch. In reality connectivity would require the use of eminent domain by the taking of dedicated open space, scenic trust preserve properties, wetlands, several home lots and homes - as well as the purchase and taking of the entirety of the private roads within the Melody subdivision. Not only is that financially unachievable - is it clearly legally challengeable.</p> <p>Interconnectivity Opportunities Already Exist:</p> <p>Non-motorized pathway easements already exist both north and south in Rafter J and Melody Ranch subdivisions.</p> <p>Our HOA has already conveyed a non-vehicle access easement to our pathway system to the County with connections both on the north and south for any future connectivity. That easement does NOT allow for any vehicle traffic except as related to pathway maintenance. We do not want the County to consider changing that easement, through a takings process, into a vehicle easement - even if it was for transit.</p> <p>In addition we do not want any of our recreational open space, scenic trust preserve lands, wetlands, private lots and narrow private roads to be taken for what would become through traffic from South Park Loop road to Rafter J.</p> <p>You cannot force a taking of private property after the fact. The reality is there is no way to interconnect our Melody Ranch roads without taking both private homes and crossing permanently protected recreational and scenic trust preserve open space lands and the filling of wetlands (eastern section) - while dumping traffic onto a narrow private road system.</p> <p>Meanwhile an opportunity already exists in both Rafter J and Melody Ranch with connections both north and south for future connectivity to their public non-motorized pathways systems.</p> <p>In closing we request that you clarify the maps for district 10 so that interconnectivity unmistakably is identified as non-motorized pathway, and not road, interconnectivity.</p>

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Sturgis, Mindy and Greg Interested Public	<p>I am writing as a concerned resident regarding the proposed re-do of the current Comprehensive Plan provisions.</p> <p>My husband and I are part time residents and own a home in Melody Ranch. We are extremely fortunate to spend half the year here. We've owned property in Jackson since we were first introduced to the area in 1986 and fell in love with the enormous beauty, wildlife, small town charm and especially the vast open space that is so unique to Jackson.</p> <p>I was born in N.Y. and then moved to Ft. Lauderdale in the 70's. Our primary residence is still there but mainly because of close family ties. We have seen the city go from a small town to an unplanned explosion of high rises, traffic and congestion all in the name of "progress" and "economic development". We couldn't disagree more.</p> <p>Increased urbanization of Jackson would be a crime whether it is on the Westbank or Southpark where there is existing infrastructure.</p>
		<p>Please keep Teton County a sanctuary for humans and animals alike. It truly is a very special place and it would be a shame to see it destroyed by short sightedness.</p>
2/8/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	<p>Sorry, I'll be less windy... Peter Moyer from the Village Road area. Just starting at the north on the character districts—and I'm only speaking for myself—Teton Village, instead of dumping more residential density up there, it would make sense to me... what they've missed up there is having a real Village. And frankly I would love to see more really appropriate commercial zoning, so you don't just have hotbeds up there dumping into other parts of the Valley. I think it makes it a much more quality experience up there, plus in some ways it takes pressure off the roads if you do it right. So, that's one thing. The Aspens, I won't repeat, we've been through all that. I really appreciate, and I think a lot of people really appreciate, your decision when it was time for stability, which is what so many of these neighborhoods want to encourage. Wilson, it's the same thing, you know. You look at Wilson and the Aspens and in terms of creating a lot of new up-zone density in areas that are about 12 to 15 feet beneath the bed of the Snake River right on the Teton Fall just never made a whole lot of sense to a lot of us. I mean, those of us who are there, yes, it's a risk you accept, but in terms of future up-zone density for Wilson, the Aspens area just never made sense. Teton Village is much higher, it's not a problem, even though it's on the Fall. Moving down to other parts of Town, South Park, the Town, to me the key thing is sort of honoring as best you can the sort of wishes and desires of the people in those neighborhoods, so you're not just dumping density from on high from the Ivory Tower where it's really doing it right and making it comfortable for them. You look at what's gone on here and we have a pretty severe recession. What people love is stability. In hard times like this, stability is really important. So, sort of zapping neighborhoods with sort of up zoning decrees coming from on high, I just don't think it's proper at this time, plus the free market actually has been working great along those lines. There's less of a demand on the workforce, we've lost thousands of jobs, plus prices in a free market have come down dramatically. And I've always seen, and I think a lot of people see, Victor, Driggs, Alpine as being part of our community. That's part of our workforce, too, and it just seems nuts to think that by creating new up-zone density, we can compete with prices in Driggs and Alpine and areas like that where they're not deed restricted. They don't need public subsidies. The prices are low. They've got, what is it, 17,000 unbuilt lots over in Teton County Idaho in that region. You know, for us to think we can meet some artificial 65 percent workforce thing just seems crazy, common-sense wise, plus, according to the Housing Authority, the Fall 2010 Report, 68 percent of the households here in Teton County Wyoming work here. That's doing pretty good. I mean, it's really doing well right now and the market has done well as it stands right now. And the second homes, they're not the enemy. I mean, that's part of Jackson Hole. It's a big part of our economy, second homes, and to come up with some artificial workforce housing thing as the driving force to meet some artificial standards just doesn't seem to make sense and it just creates this tension where you're dumping density in neighborhoods. So, thanks, and I apologize if I went too long the last time. Thank you guys for your public service. I mean, it's really appreciated. I mean, we just sort of show up in a cameo appearance; you guys do the work. Thank you.</p>

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	<p>Hi, Rich Bloom for South Park neighbors. A hundred and seven meetings, four and a half years, I think I've been to 105 of them. Two things. One is just on the record Staff has promised to correct 10.2 to match 10.0 on the importance of the district's open space for wildlife movement. This will fix the incorrect statement in 10.2 that wildlife move solely along Flat Creek, so I just wanted to get it on the record, but Alex assures me that it will already be done. Staff has also promised to correct 10.1 to match the changes Staff has put forward on 10 and 10.2, that whole into and adjacent to existing developed areas. Is that the ?? language? I think Staff is planning new language. Clarify the goal of directing development that does occur into a transition area or clustering it near existing development with the incorporation of permanent open space. So that will apply to all those three areas that have that alternate language. I think that's a good compromise language. I think it respects all of our existing private property rights and it gets to the intent to let those landowners in central Northern South Park to cluster on their own properties. The big mistake and the thing we didn't get to in 5.6 is this clause that's on your modification that says, insert that it develop the subarea should include redundant streets, grids, alleys, small lots and a small area of mixed-use. Let's put mixed-use aside. The rest of that language should be removed, as it's in direct conflict with the existing language. The existing language says a possible location for residential development has a similar density to the adjacent West Jackson neighborhood. And it also says should development be needed, it should be the subject of a neighborhood planning effort so it will get to those details earlier. I talked to Alex at length Monday. I talked to Ben Ellis Thursday afternoon and we just had a hallway discussion. And what really happened there was Commissioner Ellis brought up the idea of shrinking 5.6 considerably by half or more, and perhaps increasing the density as a concept. And that's where he brought in the words of grid and alleys under that concept. It was discussed with that joint group and the group did not push either the grid, alleys forward or a change in the footprint. Unfortunately, Staff made the mistake of letting that language slip through. And by putting through that, and we'll go through these, redundant streets isn't really needed because 7.3.a, says all new developments have to have connectivity, interconnectivity; they won't be dead-end cul-de-sacs, so we have that covered. What grid, alleys and small lots infer to use that in Town, that's AR zoning. That's 16 to 18 dwelling units per acre. By referring to the neighborhoods across the street, you're looking at 4 or 5 dwelling units per acre. And what Ben Ellis—and he's here if you want to ask him—but I think what we were talking about is keeping that same amount of usage. Four to five is eight to a thousand homes. That's all of Melody Ranch, Rafter J and Cottonwood Park put together, which is half the amount you're trying to move around. If this language goes through, especially with the character-based Plan versus a numbers-based, it could infer AR zoning, which is 3000 to 3600 units. So the simplest thing to do is just to take out the grid, alleys and small lots and let that conversation come in in its entirety with the joint electeds so Ben Ellis can talk about reducing the footprint and looking at more density and have that conversation. So, the last thing is...and the same with redundancy. Redundant streets is covered in policy 7.3.a, and we also have that neighborhood planning effort coming up. Meanwhile, Barbara Allen brought up the idea about the adjacent neighborhoods and what that meant. I'm comfortable with the language as is, but I think for clarification you could say, for example, Range View Park, say you weren't talking about the apartment complex that's 24 dwelling units per acre for Ellingwood. So I would hope you would consider that. And then there was a conversation—it was very convoluted, Paul Duncker can fill you in if you want—about how we got to mixed-use. Well, by having mixed-use, that's ?? Mixed-use is commercial on the ground floor; we all know that. And yet we talk about this area being a residential use as its character. So the area is already within walking distance to local convenience. There's no need to have commercial. It would drive traffic into that area, through a school zone, and it would also pull the center of gravity from downtown by having commercial out on the periphery. So I think I would ask that you drop mixed-use. That came out of a County conversation from that because it's incompatible with the rest of the description in that area. That's it. I left that on your paper and thank you for your time as always. And I'm glad you're at the last of your 100 and some meetings.</p>

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
2/7/2012	Nolan, Ellen Interested Public	<p>I am writing to ask you not to change the comprehensive plan to increase density in South Park adjacent to Cottonwood Park neighborhood and the schools. This whole area is already very, very dense from Indian Trails, through the Blair House apartment complex, the affordable housing developments, Cottonwood Park, the schools and on to Gregory Lane industrial complex, and Smiths shopping center. In the past 12 years alone, I have seen traffic increase and the night sky dim with night light pollution.</p> <p>I understand that the landowners of NW South Park already have the right to develop their property as a residential neighborhood, but the changes you are discussing could increase the allowable density as well as permit light industrial or commercial development.</p> <p>In today's persisting economic climate, I do not understand why anyone wants to change the existing plan when there is apparently plenty of room to develop both residential and commercial space in town under the existing plan, and while sales of existing homes and vacant land have plummeted. Whose interests are you serving? I don't know anyone who thinks it is a good idea or even needed.</p> <p>I cannot improve on the following points, so please accept them as if I had written them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">o We do not want additional density dumped into South Park from anywhere else in the valley.o The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our South Park rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their lands in South Park.o Without this linkage – we do not support any additional density in NW South Park. We do not need any more development, and the sole reason for consideration of the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of South Park ranch lands.o The NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the in-fill potential in Town is completed.o If some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Rangeview Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park.o We do not need any additive industrial over what the entitlements already allow in the future on Gregory Lane that would worsen the safety issues for students and families using High School Road. The industrial areas just south of town are the more appropriate place for future light industry.o Most importantly, High School Road should be a residential and school campus road, period. We do not want it turned into a congested highway collector that would endanger the safety and lives of any school student or family residents living nearby.

Thank you for taking my concerns into serious consideration.

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
2/6/2012	Creel, Margaret Interested Public	<p>Thank-you for all the work that you have put in over the last number of years to make sure that you come up with a comprehensive plan that speaks to the needs and wants of this community. It has been a long process, one that I have paid close attention to, and one that simply seems to be in constant flux.</p> <p>Although I applaud you in your recent recognition of not increasing densities in the Aspens area, I strongly urge you to not add that density to other areas in Teton County, simply because you "have to put it somewhere". This is clearly not good planning. In particular, South Park in its entirety is not nor has it ever been the logical place to dump density although there are forces that are arguing to the contrary. As you move forward towards the conclusion and subsequent adoption of the new comprehensive plan, please uphold the map descriptions and delineations that affirm the scenic, wildlife, and ranching heritage values for all of South Park (District 10). In addition, do not even consider putting more density in the NW corner of South Park until infill in the town of Jackson has occurred. This alone could take years. As at least a half century of growth is already entitled here in Teton County, I would say it's a slippery slope to put together a plan that encourages more density and more development especially given our current economic climate. As much attention has been given to the fragmentation of South Park into the NW portion and other parts, let me be clear in stating that there needs to be significant clarification in the plan that ties any development in the NW portion of South Park to the permanent protection of the rest of South Park. Any development in Northwest South Park needs to be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands – period.</p> <p>To be quite honest, I do not support any kind of development in South Park. The recent deaths of moose along the Village Road has led to an outcry from many in the community. Why is it that the death of moose elicit more emotion than the death of deer, elk, coyotes, foxes, skunks, owls, hawks, mink and others? These are the animals that I have either seen killed or dead along High School Road, South Park Loop Road, and South Highway 89 over the years that I have lived in Rafter J. These animals are all using the corridors between the Snake River and the foothills to the West and East as well as moving both north and south in annual patterns. They do not understand delineations and designations. Although laudable that you are looking at the importance of the Flat Creek riparian area to wildlife, do not fail to recognize the importance of the larger land area of South Park and the habitat and food resources that it provides. I bet the wildlife that have no voice, will appreciate it.</p> <p>Again, thank-you for the time and effort you have put in towards coming up with a plan that speaks to the better good of this community in the future. Your attention to the importance of wildlife and their movements needs to continue to play a major role in what you decide as you move forward.</p>

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
2/5/2012	McGregor, Bob and Kim Interested Public	<p>I know you're hearing a lot these days - and I thank you for listening - but it's the same, familiar-by-now story that ordinary people have been trying to get across, since the early days of '08. Wildlife, wildlife crossings, neighborhood character, keeping rural places rural, and of course, my favorite, dumping of density, specifically into South Park.</p> <p>So, at the risk of redundancy, please uphold the map descriptions that affirm scenic, wildlife, wildlife crossings and rural heritage values of ALL of South Park. Also, any development in northwest South Park needs to be solidly linked to the large rural land stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands. Please, Please no dumping of density from places like Buffalo Valley or anywhere else into South Park. NO infill from town should be allowed anywhere until the town infill potential has been satisfied, nor any commercial in S.P. The people are just not into the rampant growth that could happen.</p> <p>Sorry to be a broken record here but these things are important and we've all slogged through 4 years of this comp plan revision process, to the tune of I've-forgotten-how-much public money. We've lived here 33-34 years, respectively, and have seen so many changes. Please, once again, listen to the common people and take these thoughts into consideration in your deliberations. At the moment we are out of the country and not able to attend meetings, but we have been to so many over the years, and are currently being kept up to speed via emails.</p> <p>Thank you again for taking the time to listen to 2 more residents of Teton County, and for considering what we've said.</p> <p>We look forward to resolving these issues soon, as we're sure you do as well.</p>
2/5/2012	Greger, Art Interested Public	<p>I am reading the Illustrating our Vision document on the comprehensive plan. What a beautiful picture of what I believe to be Phelps Lake. This illustrates very well what most people have indicated they want in this comprehensive plan... conservation. The nodes concept has been changed to complete neighborhoods, but the idea is the same. Growth in these areas has been consistently opposed - witness the opposition to growth in the Aspens just this week.</p> <p>I live in Rafter J and love the quality of life here; I oppose any development of South Park. It is probably the most scenic area that everyone sees coming into our tourist town. It needs to be preserved for its scenic and wildlife values as it is.</p> <p>I don't believe growth is really needed at this time. How long will the old Valley Feed sit empty? How long will the land west of Staples be for sale? How long will it take to sell the old Mojos, or the old Bubbas? How long will the new lots developed in Rafter J sit empty? When will the hole that is McCabe Corner turn into a swimming pool? How many people are trying to sell existing homes and can't? Infill and improvement are much more needed than more sprawl and area to be developed. A well developed line to the beginning of town exists at High School road, and should be preserved as such.</p> <p>I see in the plan increased connectivity with roads in the Rafter J area. This has been consistently opposed in the past (when the New Neighborhood was proposed) and will be opposed in the future, I am sure. No one I have ever talked to in Rafter J wants this. There is too much traffic here as it is.</p> <p>The process has been dragging on for years, and it is still uncertain how many homes, of what type, are going to be put in certain areas? A goal was predictability, and I don't see it. The comments made at the beginning of this process have been consistent, and should still be considered. Most working people don't have the time to follow this lengthy process, but their opposition to increased growth in South Park still stands.</p> <p>Please focus in conservation, infill of existing areas, and improving existing areas. Please conserve the beauty and character of South Park (and the whole valley for that matter) as it exists. Don't make South Park a dumping ground for unneeded and unwanted development.</p>

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
2/4/2012	Jerger, Karen Interested Public	<p>We would like all of you to know that we very much appreciate the careful thought and intensive energy that has gone into revising the Comprehensive Plan. It has been a long, hard process, but the final drafts seem to be much improved from the originals.</p> <p>With specific regard to South Park:</p> <p>We are pleased with the maps that acknowledge the importance of special qualities in South Park (scenic, wildlife, and ranching). Please hold firm to these positives in the final draft of the Plan.</p> <p>We do not want growth in South Park beyond what is currently entitled, however we support the idea of clustered growth in South Park that is directly tied to permanent open space protection of other land WITHIN the South Park area.</p> <p>We are concerned about the types of development that may be proposed for the NW section of South Park, and feel that it should be appropriate for a location that is close to existing neighborhoods and schools. This would eliminate any industrial and some commercial activities.</p> <p>Thank you for considering our comments.</p>
2/3/2012	Swope, Linda Interested Public	<p>You may remember the photo collage I sent you a few weeks ago - wildlife roaming through my yard in Melody Ranch... I have been pleased to see further progress made in the Comprehensive Plan to protect and value our truly unique resource. Thank you for listening to public input and acknowledging that our valley residents as a whole do treasure our wildlife.</p> <p>And for some of us in business here, we know that our clients are drawn here because the abundance is distinctive to Jackson Hole. The wildlife brings the families. The families book our services. We pay our taxes. Simple, really.</p> <p>And you know how we feel in South Park:</p> <p>Any development in Northwest South Park needs to be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands . We do not want unwanted density dumped into South Park from Alta, Buffalo Valley or anywhere else in the valley. The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their other South Park lands. Without this linkage – we do not support any additional density anywhere in our region – as we do not need any more development, and the sole reason for consideration of the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of these land owners other lands that dominate South Park. The NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the substantial in-fill potential in Town is completed. If some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Cottonwood Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park.</p> <p>South Park is a VITAL area for wildlife migration into our valley and beyond! The historic ranch district is the gateway...</p> <p>The danger now is writing in more growth. I don't know one valley resident that wants MORE growth. Please keep your ear to the ground. That rumble is us, the taxpayers who you represent.</p> <p>Let's keep the progress we've made and know when to call it good.</p> <p>Thank you for your time!!</p>

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
2/3/2012	Heileson, Marv and Juli Interested Public	<p>As you (finally!) finalize the Comprehensive Plan revision, please do not give up on South Park and treat it as the County's unloved stepchild. It would be totally unfair to use South Park as the density dumping ground for more development that no other neighborhood wants either. A lot of us have been reluctantly willing to tolerate some limited additional density in the northwest corner of South Park, so long as it 1) was only used to preserve rural land elsewhere in South Park, and 2) was consistent with the density of the surrounding neighborhoods. But any such development should not precede development in town; otherwise, the whole goal of "Town as Heart" would be meaningless.</p> <p>When Leland Christiansen was a County Commissioner, he stated at a South Park public meeting that "this is the community's plan." Planning Commissioner Patricia Russell said essentially the same thing at a meeting last month. Over the last four years, the community has said over and over that they don't want more density added to the valley. We already have zoning enough to double the growth we have now; if this is really the community's plan, how can it identify more "spots" for additional density? The only people that would benefit from more growth are the few large landowners/developers that want to make money at the expense of everything else, including residents, wildlife, and ultimately the economy of Jackson Hole, which is so dependent on the quality of its environment – both natural and built.</p> <p>The proposed plan started out by offering up South Park as a sacrificial lamb to growth. Over the last four years, thanks to vigorous input from the community, and responsiveness from the electeds, it has been changed to be more responsive to preserving the qualities that make South Park a primary contributor to the overall special quality of Jackson Hole. We're almost there; please stay the course, preserve the character of South Park and in turn the valley as a whole.</p>
2/2/2012	Harvey, Ann Interested Public	<p>I am writing once again to comment on the seemingly endless comprehensive plan process. The bottom line, I think, is that you need to ensure that the plan lives up to its lofty ideals of protecting wildlife, habitat, scenery, and the other values that define Jackson Hole. You do not do this by adding more growth, whether it's in Wilson, the Aspens, South Park, or anywhere else in the valley. The more growth the plan allows, the more fragmented and degraded wildlife habitat becomes, and the more Jackson Hole resembles all the other places where humans dominate the landscape. Please stop thinking in terms of nodes, or spots, or whatever other cancerous terms describe additive growth in Jackson Hole. We do not want or need a plan that calls for more growth. It's hard to imagine what Jackson Hole will be like with the doubling in growth that's already allowed--how can you possibly think that it's your duty to encourage even more?</p> <p>When will specific mechanisms for decreasing development in rural areas, and permanently preserving open space, be revealed to the public? Learning from the newspaper that there's a lot of "flexibility" in how 2000 potential units will be shifted from rural areas to denser areas does little to inspire confidence that this is anything more than fantasy. It's a laudable ideal to concentrate growth in the town of Jackson and decrease it in the rural parts of the valley, but until the second part of the equation is dealt with, you shouldn't be even considering additive growth anywhere in the County. After 4 years of planning, shouldn't the means of decreasing density be figured out? It's easy to allow more growth and hard to preserve open space, but taking the path of least resistance is not exactly good planning.</p> <p>I'm glad to see that the current version of the plan calls for preserving much of South Park instead of making the whole thing a density dumping ground. Please stick to this. And if any increase in density is approved for the Northwest corner, it must be clearly tied to decreasing density and permanent open space protection throughout the rural areas of South Park. The map descriptions should affirm this and be consistent with the plan language. No density increase should be directed to South Park until the Town has reached its infill potential. And no commercial development should be allowed in South Park.</p> <p>I am also entirely supportive of the Village Road residents who object to adding growth to the Aspens area. It just doesn't make sense to do that, given transportation and infrastructure issues, as well as wildlife values in that part of the valley.</p>

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
2/2/2012	Dunlap, Dave Interested Public	<p>I am opposed to using the South Park area as a dumping ground for the rest of the county. Adding anywhere near 1000 homes is shortsighted and voids any concern for wildlife and responsible growth.</p> <p>I have been participating for four plus years in this process – I expect you to UPHOLD the map descriptions that now affirm the scenic, wildlife, wildlife connectivity and ranching heritage values of ALL of South Park (called district 10).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• We do not want additive growth from anywhere in the valley when we already have 50-70 years of growth already entitled – a rough doubling of our built environment on the ground today!• Any development in Northwest South Park needs to be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands . We do not want unwanted density dumped into South Park from Alta, Buffalo Valley or anywhere else in the valley.o The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their other South Park lands.o Without this linkage – we do not support any additional density anywhere in our region – as we do not need any more development, and the sole reason for consideration of the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of these land owners other lands that dominate South Park.o The NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the substantial in-fill potential in Town is completed.o If some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Cottonwood Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park.

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
2/1/2012	Sibson, Barry Interested Public	<p>After four years of participation in the Comprehensive Plan process, I was quite pleased with the "Character District" plan for South Park. The key aspect of the SP plan was the preservation of the current open space. I am concerned, however, about the type of development and added population in the Northwest corner of the area and the concept of new roads connecting Melody Ranch, Rafter J and South Park Ranches.</p> <p>With the change of direction for the "Pines/Aspens" district, I am very concerned that there might be some thoughts of change in the South Park district. I believe that if any additional development were inserted in the SP district that it would be very detrimental to the South Park community, to wildlife movement and to the visual aspects of the approach to town.</p> <p>Important to me are:</p> <p>The open space in SP being permanently preserved, not just a zoning issue that could be changed in the future. Any development in SP should be tied contactually to preservation of open space in SP.</p> <p>A corridor for wildlife movement down the west side of SP. I live next to Bob Lucas's ranch and have frequently seen and heard elk migrating through his ranch. I believe that they come down through the Sherr Thoss property and not down Flat Creek.</p> <p>Maintenance of the rural view across SP from South 89 to the western mountains.</p> <p>Incentives for the SP ranchers to continue ranching.</p> <p>No additive development rights to those already existing.</p> <p>A decrease in allowable commercial development.</p> <p>Maintenance of a walkable town with a human scale to all development. Too many of the already developed 3 story buildings in town do not have that scale and are overwhelming. A step back of the third story should be required.</p> <p>I appreciate the fact that the proposed plan has been scaled down to be more in keeping with the desires of the community, but I DO NOT want South Park to become the default area for growth.</p>
2/1/2012	Coelho, Katherine and Interested Public	<p>In regards to the growth plan, we need to permanently conserve the large rural ranches in the NW area of South Park. These ranches help make Jackson Hole one of the most beautiful areas in the U.S. Since the majority of our economy is tourism, it is of them up most importance to preserve the beauty of the area. If it becomes necessary for some small development of this area to help the ranchers conserve the rest of their property then the development should be only in the NW corner and in the same density and character as its neighbor Cottonwood Park. As to any other increase in density in South Park it is totally unnecessary as we have 50-70 years of lands of entitled growth all ready planned for. No leap frogging - in fill must be done first.</p> <p>We also must preserve the linkage for the wild life. In all the meetings I have attended the audience has said that the wild life of Jackson Hole is one of its most important attributes for residents and visitor alike.</p> <p>Lets keep Jackson as what it is known for; wilderness, wild life and the old West.</p>

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
2/1/2012	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	<p>Whoa there pard,</p> <p>After four grueling years of dealing with planners, and elected officials I think the valley is tired of your rhetoric and BS.</p> <p>DENSITY? "Where are we going to put it?" ---- Really Paul? Every iota of this valley has been platted and planned for. Right now in South Park if all the large rural land owners decided to cash in there would be another 500 homes. Along with those 500 homes would come a lot of permanent open space. ---Permanent---. And there is nothing you could do about it.</p> <p>Not to forget the 73 homes in Melody Ranch 2 that are still on a piece of paper in someone's file cabinet, or the 32 vacant lots in Melody 1. Is Shooting Iron built out? Three Creeks?</p> <p>You are not the density commissioners. You are the elected officials and planning commissioners. Yup,----- that's we the people you hear hollering boys. "We The People" are herding up and we don't like the color of that horse you're riding.</p>
1/30/2012	Gammer, Michele Interested Public	<p>I write to you as a resident of South Park. I have been attending meetings and following developments on the Comprehensive Plan over the past four years. I have written to you previously to share my viewpoint.</p> <p>I respectfully urge that you UPHOLD the map descriptions that now affirm the scenic, wildlife, wildlife connectivity and ranching heritage values of ALL of South Park (district 10).</p> <p>Please do not burden South Park with additive growth from anywhere in the valley when we already have 50-70 years of growth already entitled – a rough doubling of our built environment on the ground today!</p> <p>In addition, I request that any development in Northwest South Park be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands – period. Unwanted density should NOT be dumped into South Park from Alta, Buffalo Valley or anywhere else in the valley.</p> <p>The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their other South Park lands.</p> <p>oWithout this linkage – I do not support any additional density anywhere in our region – as we do not need any more development in South Park, and the sole reason for consideration of development in the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of the balance of the lands in South Park.</p> <p>oThe NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the substantial in-fill potential in Town is completed.</p> <p>oIf some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Cottonwood Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park.</p> <p>To date, much progress has been made during the course of your deliberations to protect South Park, its vistas and its wildlife migration routes and I sincerely appreciate your efforts in that regard. Please remain steadfast in your commitment to protect our beautiful portion of the valley.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my input.</p>

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
1/30/2012	Rhea, Rebecca Interested Public	<p>I have owned a home in Single Tree Ranch Subdivision for the past 7 years and lived in many different places in Jackson Hole since 1978. For more than 3 decades I have witnessed many failed planning efforts in Jackson Hole. It seems like the developers always win. I think it is finally time to set reasonable growth limits and once and for all to protect neighborhoods so the quality of life, social, scenic and wildlife values that make Jackson Hole a desirable place to live, work, and vacation are not sacrificed. I believe it is important to keep population growth and development at reasonable levels so there is adequate infrastructure. Infrastructure needs must be able to be met within the current and projected tax revenues.</p> <p>I have a particular interest in District 10 (South Park) where I live. This district is significant habitat for wildlife and is particularly important for migrating elk and wintering moose. I have personally observed more than 100 elk at a time spend several weeks in the ranch land adjacent to my house, observed elk in my backyard and migrating through my neighborhood. I frequently see moose, coyotes, fox, bald eagles, and osprey from my house. Trumpeter swans, Canada geese, Great Blue Herons, numerous other birds and mammals live in or pass through South Park.</p> <p>I have been participating in the latest comprehensive plan effort for the past four years. I strongly believe that it is not appropriate to increase the density of South Park is a trade off for reducing density elsewhere. South Park has already been developed to a level that should not be exceeded after buildout of existing lots is complete.</p> <p>Sub-area 5.6 should be strictly tied to the minimum amount of growth so there can be permanent conservation of the large rural landowners other South Park Lands. Development of this area should complement the existing development there, particularly the three school campuses.</p>
		<p>The South Park Loop road cannot handle increased traffic without being widened which would destroy its rural character and recreational values.</p> <p>This planning effort needs to be finally completed so that the time and energy of elected officials and landowners can be better spent on preserving what is best about Jackson Hole and meeting the other challenges of the future.</p>
		<p>Thank you for your consideration of my position on this matter.</p>
1/30/2012	Muschawreck, Erika and Interested Public	<p>we congratulate you all for the conscientious and diligent work you have done for such a long time in planning the future for Jackson Hole. In a few weeks the new comprehensive plan will be decided and we hope you will consider these last points in your decision.</p> <p>We have been participating from the beginning in this process and want you to uphold the map descriptions that now affirm the scenic, wildlife, wildlife connectivity and ranching heritage values of the whole of Jackson Hole, and especially all of South Park without raising the possibility of development to more than is already allowed in the existing comprehensive plan.</p> <p>We do not want additive growth in the valley when we already have 50-70 years of growth already entitled.</p> <p>Observing the wild animals in Jackson Hole is the most important and talked about happening. We live on the North end of Indian Trails. There are still several moose visiting our neighborhood, there is still the bald eagle's nest on high school butte, but the elk herd which was also coming through every winter does not appear anymore since the Teton Science School built their buildings in the canyon North of 22.</p> <p>Please cast your votes confirming the voluminous specific and consistent comments from this community and you will be forever gratefully remembered.</p>

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
1/30/2012	Balogh, Holly Interested Public	<p>I am a resident of Melody Ranch where my family has lived for the past 11(!) years. As a concerned citizen about growth and most importantly about the wildlife and wild lands in this region, I wanted to provide some comments about the planning process.</p> <p>I took time out of my schedule to attend one of the mapping and planning workshops in Rafter J back in October. Prior to that, I had participated in other planning discussions over the past several years. From these discussions, I expect that the commission will uphold the descriptions that were discussed and commented on for all of South Park – district 10. It was very clear that the majority of residents at the mapping discussion holds scenic, wildlife, and wildlife connectivity as sacred and fully expects that these values will be addressed and not compromised in the final plans.</p> <p>It is extremely important to me that there is no additional growth placed in the valley when we already have 50 plus year of growth already entitled. It is also extremely important to me that development in Northwest South Park be linked to the large rural land owner steward in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands. Without this linkage the entirety of South Park could be developed – completely destroying the values we all hold so dear.</p> <p>Moreover, I think it extremely important that development be completed in town and any potential development be finished their before expansion into other rural Teton county areas. If we do develop part of the NW corner of South Park, let's be smart. Let's develop it like Cottonwood or Indian Trails and not destroy the residential areas with commercial or other mixed use that makes parts of Town, and areas behind Smiths look like a total junk show from any outsider's observations.</p> <p>I'd like to remind you about our wildlife. We must make these steps to protect our animals who share our space. We choose to live here and want to keep our wildlife alive. Providing them room to roam is critical to their long term survival. This month alone I have had two different mom and baby moose sets, bald eagle, fox, and trumpeter swans in my back yard. Help me help them by protecting this crucial.</p> <p>Thank you very much for listening. Please feel free to contact me for further discussion.</p>
1/30/2012	Salter, Andy Interested Public	<p>I am a resident of South Park, I have been closely following your efforts over the past four years to revise the Comprehensive Plan and I have written you previously to express my views.</p> <p>PLEASE UPHOLD the map descriptions that now affirm the scenic, wildlife, wildlife connectivity and ranching heritage values of ALL of South Park (district 10).</p> <p>Please do not saddle South Park with additive growth from anywhere in the valley when we already have 50-70 years of growth already entitled – a rough doubling of our built environment on the ground today!</p> <p>Any development in Northwest South Park needs to be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands – period. Unwanted density should NOT be dumped into South Park from Alta, Buffalo Valley or anywhere else in the valley.</p> <p>The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their other South Park lands.</p> <p>oWithout this linkage – I do not support any additional density anywhere in our region – as we do not need any more development in South Park, and the sole reason for consideration of development in the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of the balance of the lands in South Park.</p> <p>oThe NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the substantial in-fill potential in Town is completed.</p> <p>oIf some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Cottonwood Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park.</p> <p>Much progress has been made during the course of your deliberations to protect South Park, its vistas and its wildlife migration routes and I sincerely appreciate your efforts in that regard. Please remain steadfast in your commitment to protect our beautiful portion of the valley.</p>

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
1/28/2012	Bloom, Rich	Outcomes related to PRD, District's 5.6 and 10 from Thursday's meeting.
	Interested Public	I hope to see some clarification on several of these decisions before the staff report - not only by the joint planning commission meeting on Thursday but also the County meeting on January 12 - as I do not believe you have captured the strong intent on some of these decisions – especially on the intent of 5.6 and its linkage to 10.1 and 10.2.

So here is what I heard from the joint planning commission meeting (plus some additional notes in a few areas from the joint electeds/planning commissions meetings of the County on January 12 and Town on January 11):

PRD and clustering tools:

- PRD and clustering options were re-affirmed Thursday as critical to large land owner options. That will be incorporated into the plan body more clearly.
- The direct reference in the tables of clustering – thus PRD option on properties only at 160 acres and above – was removed Thursday. Everything from 35 acres up should have clustering incentives.

Area 5.6

- Area 5.6 — now a clear direct link to these two owner's other properties in 10.2 and also district 9 (Snake River bottom properties below Shooting Iron).
- Clarifying the intent of 5.6 is to use the PRD and non-contiguous PRD (with these land owners disconnected other properties along the Snake River) to achieve permanent open space throughout South Park - and other rural areas if a TDR tool is ever successful.
 - o This is the key point also confirmed by the County Commissioners – which has yet to be made clear. I expect language that shows the clear linkage here as both bodies where clear in their direction. You can leave an opening to transfer from other rural lands outside of South Park – but we know there are significant barriers to that being realized.
 - In-fill priority to town remains first – but should not preclude a meaningful proposal from the families (Gill and Lockhart) that protects important scenic, wildlife and wildlife connectivity - as well as agricultural heritage - parcels in South Park – especially as controlled by these same owners.
 - o The County also took this position but, like the above, you have not captured their clear intent. I expect to see that clearly stated.
 - On cutting the reason for “before in-fill” – the planning commissions clearly cut “workforce housing” and “other community benefits” – not because those do not have value – but they should not be reasons to move forward on 5.6 before Town, and other complete neighborhoods, achieve in-fill.
 - o The joint County meeting January 12 – again it was not discussed about other community benefits period, meanwhile Hank Phibbs got no other elected support on adding workforce housing as a reason to proceed on 5.6 before in-fill in Town. In fact Paul V. opposed that idea.
 - o Meanwhile the Town joint meeting from January 11 clearly stated in-fill first period – tied to the growth management plan – with no other conditions or triggers.

District 10, sub-area 10.1 and 10.2

- 10.1 language will stay the same on the intent is to preserve these critical open space areas – clarification will be added that if clustering development is needed to do that – that it should be directed to the north into area 5.6. This is an aspirational goal that does not preclude Seherr-Thoss by clustering adjacent to either South Park Ranches or Melody Ranch – but the big idea of the plan is to see if there is a way to transfer development potential to the north into area 5.6
- 10.2 – again both the joint planning commissions and the County meeting from January 12 clearly responded to the obvious link since 80% of 10.2 are the same land owners that own 100% of area 5.6. I expect to see clear language and direction recognizing that both groups affirmed this. So very clear language on preserving the area is the intent – and if some development is necessary to achieve that due to clustering incentives – then to the north into area 5.6. Again this is aspirational so does not preclude Lucas from doing an independent PRD and have that clustered potential move next to South Park Ranches in the southern portion of his parcel. But the big idea of course in the plan is to see if that potential can be moved to the north

10: South Park

Date Name

Comment

into area 5.6.

•The focus is on achieving permanent protection through the PRD and possible TDR – and not through zoning alone in 10 and 5.6. District 5.6 is truly unique in its potential to use existing tools on the books to achieve the plan's goals. I would remind you also that there are 35 acres zoned Suburban in the NW corner of 5.6.

•10.2 – Both language and mapping on wildlife movement throughout the district that matches the description in the general introduction mentioned in 10. Both groups by default affirmed that – and staff has said they already intend to correct those biological mistakes that claim the only wildlife movement of large mammals is along Flat Creek. Alex has assured me these green changes have been captured (E-W and N-S) - and will be made - but I have yet to see them listed in a list of proposed changes.

oNOTE: when I drove home late Thursday evening another elk had just been killed on the Lockhart side of HWY 89 just ¼ mile south of Smith's. This is the same area between Smiths and Rafter J that has been shown for thirty years to have the highest wildlife collision rate between Smiths and Hoback junction on HWY 89. The group of elk had traversed from west to the east across sub-area 10.2 to reach the Snow King highlands – and one member was killed as they crossed Thursday evening.

I also felt the discussion well after the 9pm cut-off perhaps did not allow the joint planning commissions time to address the issue on "mixed use" in area 5.6. If they do not revisit that – then it will be raised again with the electeds in March as I see mixed use not only not compatible in this residential area – but also a clear threat to redevelopment and reinvestment in the Town by bringing those uses so far out to the peripheries of Town. Clearly the public has said if 5.6 becomes necessary to achieve open space protection in South Park – that they expect 5.6 to be residential, with a mix of housing types and a density that reflects the Cottonwood Park neighborhood across the street. Staffs' addition of "gridded streets and alleys" – which has not been brought up by any electeds or planning commissioners – could be misinterpreted that you are suggesting a character different from what the citizens have clearly articulated.

I appreciate staff's work on the plan – but I am also frustrated that staff seems to not be fully recognizing both public input and electeds/planning commission directives without adding their own personal bias. Perhaps that is unavoidable - so I hope you take my perspectives and comments in the spirit they are offered. If need be I would be happy to have a few score of residents at the February 8 and/or March 12 meetings to reinforce their passion for these changes - at the same level you have recently heard from other areas in the valley.

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	<p>Good evening, Rich Bloom, representing South Park neighbors. You know my comments, you know my public positions and my overarching concerns which ??, but I want to give you the specifics, so please take some notes. In area 10.2 and in 10, I think Staff's going to make these changes already, but we have some incorrect mapping of the elk and deer movements. Elk and deer do not cross the Highway and come down through the forest and then march along Flat Creek through Melody Ranch and through Rafter J. They actually move throughout the district. And so the introduction in 10 talks about wildlife moving through the district, and in 10.2, you just need to clarify that and reinforce the what's already in here. If lines are to be on the map, too, I think through a lot of districts some L-shaped lines that show east/west and north/south movement ?? is appropriate for that district. Again, the ?? and that's green changes. But the big one is I want to look at 5.6. I think all of you have read the Land Trust letter and this is the big idea that is in this Comp Plan. This is about how to protect permanent open space, you know, in rural areas. And so the whole point was not the shifting of the numbers or ???. It was using that as an ends to a means, or a means to a end, and the end is conservation. And the greatest opportunity we have in the Plan, and probably the only one that's really realistic, are the current zonings in the LDRs is in South Park. It...the 5.6 area is about 200 acres, about equally split between Rob Gill and Shelly Lockhart. Those two landowners just south of that have another 350 acres. In addition, both of them own another 600 acres below Shooting Iron, so we're talking about 2200 acres. So, both of them have great ability, without having to cooperate with anybody else, to shift that density up into a location that makes more sense. And so in 10.2, about 90 percent, 80 percent of that is those two landowners. There is a parcel by Wilson near Rafter J; he's already conserved about half of it. And then there is the Lucas parcel, about 200 acres, meaning Rafter J, Three Creeks and South Park Ranches. So, there's some language you're going to be dealing with tonight about moving development into or adjacent to existing developed areas to the ones to the south, which leads to complete confusion. That could be simply corrected about moving it in area 10.2 to the north into area 5.6. It's very clear. It gives those landowners and the Land Trust and the public clear direction to see what can be accomplished. The County did affirm that in their discussions. As far as timing, the County actually affirmed the idea of infill first in the Town, because area 5.6 could be a threat to investment in Town. But what they're really trying to say is the big idea was how do you conserve permanent open space? And the clock ticks on these families because of estate planning needs, and if those families have an opportunity to resolve that land and do a PRD amongst themselves, I think they would be ?? out any development and over time it wouldn't be a threat. So I think there's accommodation between what Town said, which is completely valid, about linking it to the growth management plan but allowing the opportunity. What is a threat is language that Staff added in where they linked an earlier timeline on area 5.6 to not just the open space protection but to a workforce housing opportunity, which would happen by default anyway, or other community benefits. And so I think you open the door by saying we want to do infill first unless we get another Teton Meadows Ranch that shows up there. Well, that would be a direct threat to investment in Town I think to those coming in contradiction versus achieving permanent open space. So think about that and just link it to the permanent protection. That's the idea. You just need to recognize this parcel is very unique because of the ownership and the control there. By doing it just to the north into 5.6 does not leave the Lucas's out. They could work with the family or they always have the right to cluster themselves on their own parcel down by South Park Ranches. I think you want some aspirational goals here. We all agree I think we'd like it up there by Cottonwood to achieve permanent open space. Thank you.</p>

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	I think I will be less than three minutes. <<inaudible>>. I was going to make specific comments, but I did want to say that I agree with ?? concerns that too many members and organizations like Save Historic Jackson Hole and the Conservation Alliance have expressed and have written to you and the elected officials about those. I wanted to make a comment about District 5.6. The fundamental principle behind increasing density in this district is conservation of the open space in middle and Southern South Park, and let's not lose sight of the fact that conservation of wildlife and open space is the justification for increases in development elsewhere in the County. There's a unique opportunity to work with large landowners in South Park to do this. And people before me have mentioned how effective the PRD tool has been in the past and how beneficial it has been to the community. So, just the section there should read do not preclude the opportunity for meaningful permanent conservation of open space in rural areas, period. Workforce housing may benefit from this increased density, but is not the driving force behind it. And also the term other community benefits is vague and effectively a loophole, so I don't think that should be in there. Also, mixed-use does not belong in District 5.6. There's a commitment to make this neighborhood consistent with the adjacent neighborhood, Cottonwood Park, where there's mixed housing, not mixed-use. I don't think that belongs there. And then for sections 10 point...just 10 in general and 10.2, the goal for District 10 is to try to preserve permanent open space in middle, southern and other areas of South Park by directing development to northwestern South Park. This is as simple as encouraging the two largest landowners in this district to concentrate development on their respective properties in Northwest South Park. So, a statement which more accurately reflects this goal would read something like any development that might occur in South Park will be directed to Northwest in subarea 5.6, something like that. And then also about the wildlife movement in District 10, I think that needs to be...well, Section 10.2, wildlife movement in this district occurs throughout, not just along the Flat Creek corridor. Someone mentioned that before. So, add language to describe that it's east to west, as well as north to south, movement of elk and other species, and this would provide a more realistic description and it would be consistent with the overall description mentioned above in District 10. Thank you.
1/26/2012	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	Hi, I'm Becky Tillson, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. I wanted to start by thanking all of you guys for the enormous amount of time you've served the last couple of years. <<inaudible>>. So, thank you for all of that. Trevor covered earlier some of our most comprehensive ?? Those are also included in our written comments. I wanted to give just a couple of specific suggestions about the maps, district map on the ?? section. Overall, in the introduction, there needs to be a statement that clearly establishes the prioritization of wildlife and natural resources, which in this Plan is the well-documented will of the community. As we did for Buffalo Valley, it should be clear that choosing a goal of housing or workforce or whatever should not trump the top priority of wildlife protection. Also, in the introduction, the definition of conservation area should be clarified that we will not only be reducing impacts of development but actually the overall development potential in the area as well. And lastly—I think Greg mentioned this earlier—there needs to be a clear consideration of commercial development potential throughout the County ?? the need for housing and the amount and type of commercial development that works with ?? districts. Specific to the districts, there's just a couple of other things. In Districts #2 and 4, I think it would be important to clarify that Flat Creek enhancements are not only social but also <<inaudible>>. In District 2, we do agree that <<inaudible>>, but I just wanted to point out right now that we don't believe it's appropriate for the ?? to extend into District 4 unless it's really explicitly limited to existing nonconforming uses. District 5, <<inaudible>>. I think...I just wanted to make it clear that the idea is not to give an up zone in Northern South Park without first trying to do it elsewhere. It is a good idea to continue the discussion on linking development in this area to the growth management plan, and perhaps a solution maybe is to have linkage to the growth management plan include the caveat allowing for development that's associated with permanent open space protection ?? In District 6, I think I mentioned that it would be important to clarify that further subdivision should not be encouraged. District...the River Bottom District mentions ?? and I think that should be included in the Town and County Periphery districts as well. In #10, the wildlife corridors that was mentioned, that Rich was talking about, east/west, are important to point out. High-density development in the Aspens, which is an area with high wildlife values and existing road kill problems and transportation problems, as you all know, is not consistent with the goals of this Plan...high-density development in the Aspens is not consistent with the goals of the Plan. We don't know exactly how ?? is slated for that area, but it makes sense to really minimize that ?? In the Village, this new change that we've been talking about, about not increasing beyond the established footprint, we think it's a good idea, but we prefer to see the amount and type of that future growth. ?? development that will generate markets rather than ?? is really inappropriate. The balance of convenience commercial and workforce residential housing could be explored but only with some analysis of the <<inaudible>>. As we change the subdistrict lines, people should be able to maintain the rural character of that gateway area, preserving the rural character ?? really explicit having a change around the lines there. That's too much and I just wanted to thank you guys again for your years of service and ?? Thank you.

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
1/25/2012	Quinn, David Interested Public	<p>First and foremost, I would like to thank you for your efforts over the past several years of working with the community and all interested parties on trying to accomplish the goal of making Teton County a place with the highest wildlife and scenic values of any place in our Country.</p> <p>In regards to the current Comprehensive Plan draft; I would like to make the following suggestions for the South Park area:</p> <p>First, the goal of wide open spaces and abundant wildlife can be achieved with the right efforts from our community. As the Land Trust stated in a recent letter to the county, it is critical to keep as many tools available for large land owners in order to preserve the character that everyone has been accustomed to. If tools such as the PRD are eliminated, many of the remaining ranches will be divided into the minimum 35 acre parcels that are allowed by State laws, and eventually the wide open spaces that everyone has been accustomed to will slowly vanish and we will be left with views of ranchettes or large second homes, with no community benefit.</p> <p>Over the past two years, various conservation groups have continued to recommend keeping as many tools available for conservation of large open spaces. Recently, it seems, with the advent of the mapping of Teton County; that many of these important thoughts have been displaced or forgotten about. It seems, as there has been strong pressure from a few minority residents in the community to put a layer of green (conservation) and blue (preservation) over any remaining rural lands in the community, disregarding that these large green areas have a base development right of one house, guest house and barn per 35 acre parcel. These same people are pressuring the county staff and elected officials to have landowners conserve their remaining lands by moving their development rights to town or a small node next to the High School Road. I am not sure if a suitable tradeoff is being suggested. In reality, and financially there are many problems with this concept. The value of the density of large tracts of rural land in the middle of South Park has a lot more value as 35 acre pieces than multiple small town sized lots next to the High School Road.</p> <p>Allowing landowners to cluster development on their own lands may be a better alternative. There are many areas throughout the County, within or next to existing development, where non-contiguous PRD's could be successful without limiting land owners to town or a node in Northern South Park. No one knows if the town or landowners in these nodes will accommodate additional density. All landowners have to be given the same opportunity to preserve their lands and cannot be confined to moving their rights to specific areas.</p> <p>In the last public comment period, 37 residents of Teton County; many that live in South Park, commented that that they would like to see additional development in Southern South Park. Many people commented that it would be a good area for equestrian use possibly with riding areas to accommodate the equestrian community that exists in South Park and the rest of the community. These residents have also expressed having a small grocery store, or amenities that would be advantageous to eliminating additional traffic to Town and beneficial to the residents of Southern South Park. It is important to provide landowners with different preservation options to choose from. Again, this is what the Land Trust has stated in their recent letter.</p> <p>My final point is that we have all been working on a character driven Comp Plan. Many people are trying to blend a number driven plan into the character plan. Please keep on track with defining the character of each district and do not fall into past mistakes of trying to add numbers to the plan. Numbers will only confuse and complicate the process beyond what people can comprehend. I have been told that a numbers plan was unsuccessfully tried in 2009.</p> <p>In closing, I appreciate your efforts and hope you can stay on track with your goals. Please see the attached copies of the comments that 37 individuals made in the last comment period. There are many concerned citizens in Teton County that believe that proper planning is the key to the livelihood of our community. Please do not let a few people pressure you into making the wrong decisions.</p>

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
1/14/2012	Bloom, Rich	Alex – thanks – I hope the public sees the changes at least several days before the January 26 meeting.
	Interested Public	Two green changes I hope staff will suggest based on the meetings we just had – and also since it is likely now that all “attributes” will be stripped from the maps including wildlife migration corridors.
		First green change:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">•In the existing general text introduction to district 10 you note on page IV-63, first paragraph “however the intensity of wildlife vehicle collisions on South HWY 89 shows the importance of the District’s open space for wildlife movement as well.”•In the area 10.2 specific description on page IV-65 (last paragraph) you get the basic biology incorrect by stating “The most important of these open spaces is the area between Flat Creek and the highway. This are not only provides the scenic gateway in Town, but also provides an open area for a wildlife crossing of the highway that would feed wildlife into a preserved Flat Creek corridor.”•I already pointed out the science demonstrates elk and other large ungulates actually move east and west across area 10.2 (also similarly through area 10.1) - as well as north and south throughout both area 10.1 and 10.2 – not just along the Flat Creek corridor. This was discussed tangentially at the County meeting by Paul Vogelheim on the inconsistency of wildlife corridor mapping across the districts.•Green change suggestion would be to align the statement on page IV-65 area 10.2 (last paragraph) with the statement on page IV-63 (first paragraph). I would suggest a biologically more correct replacement on page IV-65 be: “The most important of these open spaces is the area between Flat Creek and the highway. This area not only provides the scenic gateway in Town, but also provides an open area for a wildlife crossing of the highway to move through the district. that would feed wildlife into a preserved Flat Creek corridor.”•If corridors are mapped in an illustrative way (versus 100% accurately) then I believe Paul Vogelheim noted early in the meeting that they be consistent across all districts – by default that would include areas 10.1 and 10.2. I think if you do drop the wildlife corridor illustrative mapping (I would like it to stay) – you should still identify the known, and verified, wildlife collision hot spots on the map’s highways which do line up to JH Wildlife Foundation’s previous documentation and mapping, along with the recent WTI report the County helped to fund. The three district 10 mapped crossing hotspots (termed “wildlife crossing”) - do in fact line up with both of these reports - so no changes would be needed beyond clarifying that they are “wildlife crossing collision hot spots”.
		Second green change:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Given the discussion at the County of not fully understanding “If development does occur, the agricultural open spaces will be preserved by directing the development potential from the area into or adjacent to existing developed areas to the north or south.” I suggest in 10.2 on page IV-65, last paragraph (staff also suggested something similar at the County meeting) that the awkwardness of “into or adjacent and existing development” be addressed. The County also unanimously affirmed to tie 5.6 earlier timing (before in-fill) to opportunities of a PRD that would preserve the adjacent lands to the south.•Logically then I would simply change, as staff suggested at the meeting to the commissioners, to along the lines of: “If development does occur, the agricultural open spaces will be preserved by directing the development potential from the area into or adjacent to existing developed areas to the north or south. into area 5.6.
		Map corrections already noted to staff – also green changes:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">•The map on page IV-62 has left out the entirety of northern Flat Creek to HWY 89 portion of the Lockhart’s property.•The map on page IV-36 incorrectly locates the possible school zone expansion line on the southern boundary of the existing High School. Simply

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
		bring it up to match the boundary.
1/12/2012	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	I hope this is helpful and fully consistent with green changes and/or the electeds direction. Alex and Bruce – I know you have the tapes etc., but following is my take on where the County landed on areas 5.6 and district 10 – let me know if I got it wrong.
		Area 5.6 <ul style="list-style-type: none">•In-fill first discussion – Outcome = the in-fill language stays.•PRD addition discussion on earlier “opportunities”<ul style="list-style-type: none">oOutcome = redraft in-fill section – “promote infill, leave open opportunities resulting in permanent conservation of open space via the PRD - if applications come before “in-fill” (Town and other complete neighborhoods) is accomplished.”❑Hank added “unique workforce housing opportunities” in addition to earlier consideration before in-fill occurs – but emphasis remains on permanent open space conservation - and workforce housing secondary.•Outcome = Paul V. said no on the housing addition suggested by Hank, I do not have in my notes of any other electeds agreeing with Hank (just Paul Dunker and Peter) – not sure where this ended?oUses in district – residential only – other? – Outcome = residential focus – but a “little bit” of mixed use.oNot sure where staff’s suggestion for discussion on: “Add vision for redundant streets, variety of housing types, wildlife permeability if developed”❑Outcome = These ideas were never discussed by the group according to my notes – and they are red changes.•Boundary of district – Outcome = no change
		Area 10.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Outcome = leave as written
		Area 10.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Outcome = leave as written

Good luck the next few weeks compiling all of these “agreed” upon changes – along with what remains as written – plus your green changes.

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
1/12/2012	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Alex and Bruce – I know Shawn took notes and you have the tapes, but following is my take on where the town landed on areas 5.6 and district 10 – let me know if I got it wrong. Area 5.6 <ul style="list-style-type: none">•EW connector (South Park Loop to HWY 89) –Tie to development of 5.6. Split on need, intersection with HWY 89 causing problems, whether it would encourage development....<ul style="list-style-type: none">oSummary conclusion = soften language and mention it as "one of several possibilities" for traffic challenges in the area if that area is developed.•High School road – Summary conclusions = strengthen language to focus more improvements for pedestrians safety, school zone, reduce speed limits, traffic calming etc. as traffic "will always go there"<ul style="list-style-type: none">oBasically that HS road needs to be addressed as both the EW connector and Tribal trail connector will not solve the problems on HS road•Tribal trails connector – Summary conclusion = no changes in language – leave as is•Timing of considering 5.6 for development –<ul style="list-style-type: none">o"Infill first" language should be considered in all new areas (Mark O) – unsure that was generally agreed to or not?oTie are to growth management plan, urban growth boundary – all generally concurredoClarify "if necessary" language – make firm, defined, conditional - MelissaoClarify density - not just "adjacent neighborhoods" – which neighborhoods, Cottonwood Park or Ellenwood (Barbara)oSummary conclusion of Bruce = "tighten it up more, tie to growth management plan"
 Area 10.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Summary conclusion = leave as written		
 Area 10.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Summary conclusion = leave as written – let the County review•Bob's comment – connectivity between subdivisions language "too aggressive" – not sure where that conversation ended?		
 Misunderstandings I noticed: Things I learned that you should consider in your introduction to the County group this afternoon: <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Clarify that all growth management goals are met in the identified transition areas while seeking conservation/preservation of the identified rural areas.oThat an important portion of the plan is to stay within "no more than twice the build environment"•Radio grounds – current location is committed under a 24 year lease to the fair board.•That the Tribal Trails connector and the east-west connector in area 5.6 are two different road sections.oThat there is an easement for Tribal Trails but not one for the theoretical east-west connector in area 5.6.•That the unmapped existing wildlife movement corridors east-west and north-south (apart from the identified Flat Creek corridor that you did map in areas 10.1 and 10.2) is causing some confusion (I know this is a green change I have pointed out – but the current missing wildlife corridors did influence the 10.2 discussion).		
 Items of importance to staff that were never brought up for discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none">•You never brought to discussion in 5.6 two red items of staff that should be discussed with the County:<ul style="list-style-type: none">o"Add allowance for location of PRD development"o"Add vision for redundant streets, variety of housing types, wildlife permeability if developed"		

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
1/9/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	<p>If Save Historic Jackson Hole were allowed to participate in the "Red Dot" exercise this week, the attached list is where we would place our dots. After each dot is a brief explanation of why we would place our dots there.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•The Plan must include building and density numbers.<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦A Plan without metrics isn't a real plan.•Any density increase must be balanced with density decrease.<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦Permanent Protection of sensitive areas was and is the objective, not town growth.◦Protection of sensitive areas is what was sold to the public and the promise needs to be kept.•No Zoning changes and density transfer until a mechanism is in place.<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦With 50-70 years of growth already in the pipeline, we have time to get this right.•Protect rural character and small town atmosphere everywhere.<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦Jackson Hole is all about small town rural character; that's what we are.◦The current draft only extends this protection to the Town Square.•Eliminate contradictory and confusing definitions.<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦We can provide a list, but start with "stable" and "complete neighborhoods."•Do not encourage development in Northern South Park.<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦Infill in Town before we sprawl south.◦We do not want to refight the Porter Annexation battle.•Do not expand the Lodging Overlay.<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦The existing overlay already allows for more lodging, where's the need to make it larger? We are rarely at full occupancy now.•No Density increase in difficult/sensitive areas.<p>The following areas all have access problems and are adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. They should not see increases in density.</p><ul style="list-style-type: none">◦Between Broadway and Flat Creek in Midtown and Town Commercial Core.◦Steep hillsides at the "Y"◦Commercial development at the Aspens should not expand across 390.

11: Wilson

Date	Name	Comment
2/27/2012	Harrington, Kathy Interested Public	<p>As I listen and talk, and travel around listening to neighbors, guests, life time residents, I continue to hear the same thing over and over. Who is the WE that wants all this up-zoning, who is the WE that can't get along with our existing plan?</p> <p>As I drove to Teton Village the night of February 8th and saw the freshly killed calf moose, I was trying, as I have been for the past 6 months to think of my comments to you all after attending one of your plan meetings, my comments began to form. It wasn't until I arrived at Shooting Star to be greeted with the foulest sewer odor, I am not kidding when I say it made my eyes run and my stomach turn. Then I went to the Mangey Moose where the smell permeated the entire building. It was disgusting.</p> <p>My comment was born. Until we upgrade our Sewers at both the Pines and the Village, and do something about the carnage and traffic on the Village road and 22 you have no business up-zoning any areas on the west bank. We have been good stewards to the HA, we have both affordable and attainable in Wilson and Teton Village. We as tax paying citizens have done enough to help provide housing. No one bought me a house, or gave me a subsidy. Enough. The people of Teton County are speaking loud and clear, we like our little county as it is, some of us can say you are all in our back yard. We were here first. There is not one property owning citizen in Teton County that deserves to have the zoning changed in or around their neighborhood.</p> <p>PLEASE KEEP THE WESTBANK STABLE.</p>
2/8/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	<p>Sorry, I'll be less windy...Peter Moyer from the Village Road area. Just starting at the north on the character districts—and I'm only speaking for myself—Teton Village, instead of dumping more residential density up there, it would make sense to me...what they've missed up there is having a real Village. And frankly I would love to see more really appropriate commercial zoning, so you don't just have hotbeds up there dumping into other parts of the Valley. I think it makes it a much more quality experience up there, plus in some ways it takes pressure off the roads if you do it right. So, that's one thing. The Aspens, I won't repeat, we've been through all that. I really appreciate, and I think a lot of people really appreciate, your decision when it was time for stability, which is what so many of these neighborhoods want to encourage. Wilson, it's the same thing, you know. You look at Wilson and the Aspens and in terms of creating a lot of new up-zone density in areas that are about 12 to 15 feet beneath the bed of the Snake River right on the Teton Fall just never made a whole lot of sense to a lot of us. I mean, those of us who are there, yes, it's a risk you accept, but in terms of future up-zone density for Wilson, the Aspens area just never made sense. Teton Village is much higher, it's not a problem, even though it's on the Fall. Moving down to other parts of Town, South Park, the Town, to me the key thing is sort of honoring as best you can the sort of wishes and desires of the people in those neighborhoods, so you're not just dumping density from on high from the Ivory Tower where it's really doing it right and making it comfortable for them. You look at what's gone on here and we have a pretty severe recession. What people love is stability. In hard times like this, stability is really important. So, sort of zapping neighborhoods with sort of up zoning decrees coming from on high, I just don't think it's proper at this time, plus the free market actually has been working great along those lines. There's less of a demand on the workforce, we've lost thousands of jobs, plus prices in a free market have come down dramatically. And I've always seen, and I think a lot of people see, Victor, Driggs, Alpine as being part of our community. That's part of our workforce, too, and it just seems nuts to think that by creating new up-zone density, we can compete with prices in Driggs and Alpine and areas like that where they're not deed restricted. They don't need public subsidies. The prices are low. They've got, what is it, 17,000 unbuilt lots over in Teton County Idaho in that region. You know, for us to think we can meet some artificial 65 percent workforce thing just seems crazy, common-sense wise, plus, according to the Housing Authority, the Fall 2010 Report, 68 percent of the households here in Teton County Wyoming work here. That's doing pretty good. I mean, it's really doing well right now and the market has done well as it stands right now. And the second homes, they're not the enemy. I mean, that's part of Jackson Hole. It's a big part of our economy, second homes, and to come up with some artificial workforce housing thing as the driving force to meet some artificial standards just doesn't seem to make sense and it just creates this tension where you're dumping density in neighborhoods. So, thanks, and I apologize if I went too long the last time. Thank you guys for your public service. I mean, it's really appreciated. I mean, we just sort of show up in a cameo appearance; you guys do the work. Thank you.</p>

11: Wilson

Date	Name	Comment
2/2/2012	Mortensen, John and P Interested Public	<p>We wanted to communicate our support for the views expressed in the advertisement in today's paper run by all the community and neighborhood groups here in our valley.</p> <p>We have lived here over twenty years, and have constantly expressed the same views of open space and wildlife resources protection. Each new plan promises to embrace these values and then ignores them. We have enclosed a photo [see email for photos of moose/deer] of some of our favorite neighbors and residents where we live in downtown Wilson.</p> <p>At the last town meeting in Wilson planners promised we would remain the same, and wildlife and current open space would be protected. But now it sounds like adverse pressure in other areas and the planning department may change that here, and the entire west side where we have limited infrastructure (roads, water, sewer, schools, etc).</p> <p>Please listen to us and fellow residents who value our historic Jackson Hole character, wildlife and open space resources. We do not want to risk what we all have expressed we hold most dear.</p>

11: Wilson

Date	Name	Comment
1/20/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	<p>There is a basic concept which has some surface appeal, and is being pushed very aggressively by some people: move un-built density away from scenic/wildlife areas, into developed areas of Jackson Hole. Yet even an appealing theoretical concept has no mettle, until it is fully examined in its practical application, in detail, by our community. Those trying to sell the deal have been painfully short on detail. It is high time to take a common sense, informed look at the concept.</p> <p>This program would be based upon two highly sensitive matters: down-zoning in many areas, which obviously sticks in the craw of some landowners while actually limiting permanent conservation measures as well, and up-zoning in old-time Jackson Hole neighborhoods like Wilson and the Aspens, plus Teton Village, which is extremely controversial as well. You had best get it right, because you are playing with fire on all sides.</p> <p>I. Down-zoning. Most of the density transfer down-zoning would come from the elimination or reduction of the clustering/permancmt open space provisions which have been in our Comprehensive Plan for decades. Landowners receive limited density bonuses if they cluster development with permanent protected open space. Is it really such a good idea to eliminate or drastically reduce this provision? The simple answer is NO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The SRA project ended up using this concept, and the result was well over 1,000 acres of permanently protected open space. Many other landowners have done so as well. That is permanentt protection which is not subject to future political change. Unlike thepending proposal.• The clustering rights are the basis for Federal tax benefits favoring local conservation easements. Reducing or eliminating the clusterihg provisions of our Plan could have a very adverse impact on the incentive to donate future conservation easements with permanently protected, critical open space - all or part of the Federal tax benefits could disappear for potential conservation easement donors.• The existing clustering provisions can be beneficial for open space and wildlife. Moreover, the benefits and burdens are adjacent - it is not one area getting open space benefits as a result of up-zonings far away. <p>Bottom line, you would be playing with fire on the landowner rights side AND on the conservation side. Sure, there could be improvements in the existing clustering provisions of the Plan: (a) the clustering provisions should be fairer to small landowners and (b) undevelopable land (streams, wetlands, hillsides, setback areas) should not count in the density bonus formula. But minor tweaking, not wholesale change. Certainly not an excuse to up-zone elsewhere!!!</p> <p>II. Up-Zoning. Your "node" up-zoning proposals have been met with fierce resistance for over 4 years, and due to tin ears of some politicians and bureaucrats the resistance will increase, for many reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The impacted neighborhoods in Wilson, South Park, Village Road area, etc. do not want the up-zoning.• Many people throughout Jackson Hole, and many visitors to Jaclson. Hole, DO NOT WANT JACKSON HOLE URBANIZED. More traffic, more wildlife kills and other adverse impacts, more loss of our friendly small town community character.• Most of the clustering density you would transfer through up-zonings elsewhere is phantom density which would otherwise never be used. Essentially phony benefits.• The groups fighting this idea are not trying to take away landowner rights: there is no right to up-zoning. <p>••••</p> <p>The bottom line is simple. You would eliminate or reduce beneficial existing clustering rules, in a manner adverse to landowners and conservationists. Although much of the current potential clustering density would never be used, you would treat it as real build-out density and transfer it to highly developable places where it will indeed be developed. The opposite of genuine conservation because you will effectively create a lot more development! And make many people very concerned: landowners, conservationists, neighborhoods, visitors.</p> <p>The concept sounds okay on the surfac:e, but it is fundamentally flawed when one takes a realistic, hard look. A classic lose, lose.</p>

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
2/28/2012	Whetzel, Josh Interested Public	i have read thru the Aspens character district. When do you actually put the policy objectives into numbers of and types of residential units to be allowed going forward? And where will this activity take place?
2/27/2012	Harrington, Kathy Interested Public	As I listen and talk, and travel around listening to neighbors, guests, life time residents, I continue to hear the same thing over and over. Who is the WE that wants all this up-zoning, who is the WE that can't get along with our existing plan? As I drove to Teton Village the night of February 8th and saw the freshly killed calf moose, I was trying, as I have been for the past 6 months to think of my comments to you all after attending one of your plan meetings, my comments began to form. It wasn't until I arrived at Shooting Star to be greeted with the foulest sewer odor, I am not kidding when I say it made my eyes run and my stomach turn. Then I went to the Mangey Moose where the smell permeated the entire building. It was disgusting.
		My comment was born. Until we upgrade our Sewers at both the Pines and the Village, and do something about the carnage and traffic on the Village road and 22 you have no business up-zoning any areas on the west bank. We have been good stewards to the HA, we have both affordable and attainable in Wilson and Teton Village. We as tax paying citizens have done enough to help provide housing. No one bought me a house, or gave me a subsidy. Enough. The people of Teton County are speaking loud and clear, we like our little county as it is, some of us can say you are all in our back yard. We were here first. There is not one property owning citizen in Teton County that deserves to have the zoning changed in or around their neighborhood. PLEASE KEEP THE WESTBANK STABLE.
2/25/2012	Cronin, Tom and Nancy Interested Public	We want to express our deep disappointment with the plans for further growth and increased density in Jackson Hole, especially along the Village Rd. As frequent visitors to Jackson, we can tell you that destroying what appeals to us and the thousands of other area enthusiasts would seriously hurt your tourist trade. Perhaps even more importantly, we believe the effect on wildlife would be disastrous. Jackson Hole has always been a retreat for us. It is a place for us to unwind and truly appreciate the beauty of this great nation. A significant part of that is seeing the wildlife that abounds. Where will these awesome creatures go? How can you bow to the self serving interests of developers and ignore the people who live and work in the Jackson Hole area? How can you justify making Jackson unattractive to its loyal visitors? How can you live with the responsibility of destroying the habitat of some of the most beautiful animals on earth? We believe the 1994 Comprehensive Plan should more than suffice and that the Commission should abide by that plan. Please think about this carefully.

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
2/22/2012	Swift, Phelps Interested Public	<p>Thanks for taking the time to read my comments. Pam and I have attended numerous meetings, written multiple letters and comments and voiced our concerns on repeated occasions.</p> <p>The "node concept" was soundly rejected after the release of the 2009 maps. It was recently repackaged under the label of "transitional" character district in the release of the Vision Maps. Thankfully, the Joint Planning Commission has rejected the attempted up-zoning of our neighborhood, District 12.2, and has recommended the preservation of our STABLE neighborhood. We appreciate the Planning Commission's consistency and urge the Board to preserve our neighborhood character.</p> <p>Pam and I have lived and owned property on the Teton Village Road since 1977, have raised our daughters here and have always volunteered our time and efforts towards making Jackson Hole a better community. Since 1978 our Raintree neighborhood has been zoned Single Family Neighborhood Conservation. We have invested our resources based upon this zoning. Our neighborhood is comfortable, modest, charming, and typifies Teton Village Road character.</p> <p>Re-zoning our neighborhood to "transitional" would hold us hostage to the angst, uncertainty, divisiveness, and prolonged battles as speculators attempt to overturn existing private covenants and restrictions, subdivide platted lots, abrogate dedicated open space, and ignore other legal impediments. Private contracts and land restrictions will always prevail over the zoning power unless the County intends to condemn property rights. One of the central tenants of the proposed Plan is to preserve community character. Teton County neighborhoods represent the fabric, charm and uniqueness of our community character. It is a huge mistake to shoehorn contrived urbanized neighborhoods into existing successful rural neighborhoods.</p> <p>We feel strongly that you should leave density where it exists today and allow the market place and private voluntary negotiations, with proper regulatory incentives, to achieve protection of the values we all cherish. Market forces will properly address cyclical housing gluts and shortages. There is no need to panic and artificially disrupt existing neighborhoods in an unrealistic attempt to achieve short term social goals.</p> <p>Finally, we all know that the Housing Authority made speculative and imprudent, perhaps illegal, land banking investments. Please do not try to vindicate their bad behavior with the stroke of a pen. It is disingenuous to upzone an entire neighborhood dominated by platted and restricted lots just to upzone an isolated parcel property purchased by the Housing Authority. Doing so will only encourage spot zoning and the destruction of existing neighborhoods.</p> <p>We, like you, are exhausted by this arduous planning process. However, we hope you will carefully consider the enormous impacts your decisions will have for years to come. Thanks again for your time.</p>
2/17/2012	Watsabaugh, Carla Interested Public	<p>The moose death last week. This morning a little calf moose was hit, dismembered and killed by a vehicle. I have lived here and am furious. This is just one reason why I am opposed to increased density in the Aspen's. You are talking development where you will remove people's property rights by down zoning, transferring, etc. to PRESERVE OUR WILDLIFE??? Are you kidding me??? We are currently destroying our moose population due to development and increase in traffic. I am convinced that you are far removed from wanting to maintain the character of Jackson Hole. I think you are unaware of what further development means to our wildlife. One of the reasons people visit here. Currently it takes 7-8 minutes for me to get out on to the Village Road at 4:30. Just who is it you claim you are representing in this community? What happened to the 1994 Comprehensive Plan and it's population cap? When are you going to stand up and say NO? I will be in touch once again, when I am not so upset!!</p>

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
2/15/2012	Hoke, Bland, Jr. Interested Public	<p>Over the past four years I have attempted to stay involved in the process of developing a new comprehensive land use plan for Teton County, a task that has been quite arduous. Now that the process is nearing completion, it seems that there has been a complete reversal of the planning commissions' recommendations in 2011. We are now back to the "nodes" concept, disguised by the name "community character districts". This, with its attendant concept of downzoning rural lands, just does not make sense. I acknowledge that the Planning Commission has modified some of the areas, but I would be remiss to fail to speak to these issues as they move to the Commissioner's desk.</p> <p>While I understand the desire to move density from the rural areas to the developed areas (nodes), I believe that the impact on established neighborhoods far exceeds the benefits gained by moving that density. This is particularly true for the Aspens/Pines node that seems to float in and out of the planning crosshairs.</p> <p>The Aspens' area that the planners have designated as transitional is anything but transitional. It has been a stable area for more than forty years thanks to consistent zoning regulations applied since the adoption of the first plan in 1978. It is characterized by grandfathered commercial and single-family homes, all of which have functioned well for the community over the years.</p> <p>The only thing transitional about this neighborhood is the pen that the Commissioners can wield that would, in all likelihood, destroy whatever character our community now enjoys. If this occurs, it will unleash a series of unintended consequences on the residents of this area. First, it will undermine the predictability of what is going to happen to every neighboring property. This will immediately cause a chilling of the market because each property will be changing character - transitional. Uncertainty is the devil in any market. The buyers attracted to this type of market will be the speculators; this will further undermine our community and cause enormous conflict and angst for the residents.</p> <p>I have seen the rendering in the report, "Illustrations of Our View," that shows a neat, orderly development of multifamily units within a new road system. What is tragically absent is any acknowledgment that there are probably 30 different landowners involved in this tract of land, all with different objectives. To accomplish a comprehensive plan for this area, all parties would need to be in agreement. The likelihood of this happening is almost zero. The unfortunate consequence will be sporadic spot zoning and hodgepodge development. One might cynically say that what exists there now is hodgepodge, but it is stable and predictable. It is a mature, comfortable and highly likeable community. In the absence of a Teton County Redevelopment Authority with condemnation powers and a lot of money, this whole experiment of large scale redevelopment will be a colossal mess.</p> <p>Also I seriously question the safety of proposing an urban node with a main highway arterial running straight through it with a design that encourages east/west pedestrian traffic across this major north/south highway. We already kill a lot of wildlife on this road, and with this plan it looks like we may just add a few pedestrians to the mix. This is very poor design and planning.</p> <p>Besides the impracticality of the plan there are also the macro problems with this proposal. There will be added traffic congestion on the Village Road; pressure on the already-crowded Wilson School; demand for more commercial services due to increased population; impacts to water and sewer services on a system that was not designed for this size population. In short it will be shoehorning density into an area that was zoned and built for the existing population.</p> <p>This simply is not what these families ever imagined. This is an irreparable cost to these folks and it is not worth the perceived benefit to be derived from the protection of other rural areas.</p> <p>I believe the whole premise of moving density from the rural areas is misguided. Responsible development in the rural areas can be done without damage to the wildlife. What is required are good covenants, reasonable County Regulations and enforcement designed to encourage peaceful coexistence with wildlife and people.</p> <p>I began developing the John Dodge subdivision areas 33 years ago and have lived in the area since 1979. Over that period of time I have seen the wildlife thrive, even as the lots were sold and houses built. When I first moved into the area there were no roaming elk; now there are herds of over 100. It has been a constant habitat for moose. When I moved in there were no trumpeter swans; now there are regularly 5 to 10. I have observed</p>

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
		grizzly bears, black bears, river otters and cougars that I have never seen before. The idea that you have to move density out of the rural zone to preserve and encourage wildlife is simply not valid.
		What has worked for land preservation are the Land Trust and the Teton County Scenic Preserve's activities, and one of their major tools has been the PRD. If this is taken away, one of the few tools that really accomplish land preservation will be taken away.
2/8/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	As elected officials I recognize the countless hours you have spent on this planning process. I would only remind you that many, many county residents have also invested time and effort to inform your decisions. Now it is with a sinking heart that many of us feel our input, and that of your planning commission, is being dismissed at the eleventh hour. Please take a careful look before you adversely impact our "community neighborhoods" forever. Sorry, I'll be less windy...Peter Moyer from the Village Road area. Just starting at the north on the character districts—and I'm only speaking for myself—Teton Village, instead of dumping more residential density up there, it would make sense to me...what they've missed up there is having a real Village. And frankly I would love to see more really appropriate commercial zoning, so you don't just have hotbeds up there dumping into other parts of the Valley. I think it makes it a much more quality experience up there, plus in some ways it takes pressure off the roads if you do it right. So, that's one thing. The Aspens, I won't repeat, we've been through all that. I really appreciate, and I think a lot of people really appreciate, your decision when it was time for stability, which is what so many of these neighborhoods want to encourage. Wilson, it's the same thing, you know. You look at Wilson and the Aspens and in terms of creating a lot of new up-zone density in areas that are about 12 to 15 feet beneath the bed of the Snake River right on the Teton Fall just never made a whole lot of sense to a lot of us. I mean, those of us who are there, yes, it's a risk you accept, but in terms of future up-zone density for Wilson, the Aspens area just never made sense. Teton Village is much higher, it's not a problem, even though it's on the Fall. Moving down to other parts of Town, South Park, the Town, to me the key thing is sort of honoring as best you can the sort of wishes and desires of the people in those neighborhoods, so you're not just dumping density from on high from the Ivory Tower where it's really doing it right and making it comfortable for them. You look at what's gone on here and we have a pretty severe recession. What people love is stability. In hard times like this, stability is really important. So, sort of zapping neighborhoods with sort of up zoning decrees coming from on high, I just don't think it's proper at this time, plus the free market actually has been working great along those lines. There's less of a demand on the workforce, we've lost thousands of jobs, plus prices in a free market have come down dramatically. And I've always seen, and I think a lot of people see, Victor, Driggs, Alpine as being part of our community. That's part of our workforce, too, and it just seems nuts to think that by creating new up-zone density, we can compete with prices in Driggs and Alpine and areas like that where they're not deed restricted. They don't need public subsidies. The prices are low. They've got, what is it, 17,000 unbuilt lots over in Teton County Idaho in that region. You know, for us to think we can meet some artificial 65 percent workforce thing just seems crazy, common-sense wise, plus, according to the Housing Authority, the Fall 2010 Report, 68 percent of the households here in Teton County Wyoming work here. That's doing pretty good. I mean, it's really doing well right now and the market has done well as it stands right now. And the second homes, they're not the enemy. I mean, that's part of Jackson Hole. It's a big part of our economy, second homes, and to come up with some artificial workforce housing thing as the driving force to meet some artificial standards just doesn't seem to make sense and it just creates this tension where you're dumping density in neighborhoods. So, thanks, and I apologize if I went too long the last time. Thank you guys for your public service. I mean, it's really appreciated. I mean, we just sort of show up in a cameo appearance; you guys do the work. Thank you.

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Sturgis, Mindy and Greg Interested Public	<p>I am writing as a concerned resident regarding the proposed re-do of the current Comprehensive Plan provisions.</p> <p>My husband and I are part time residents and own a home in Melody Ranch. We are extremely fortunate to spend half the year here. We've owned property in Jackson since we were first introduced to the area in 1986 and fell in love with the enormous beauty, wildlife, small town charm and especially the vast open space that is so unique to Jackson.</p> <p>I was born in N.Y. and then moved to Ft. Lauderdale in the 70's. Our primary residence is still there but mainly because of close family ties. We have seen the city go from a small town to an unplanned explosion of high rises, traffic and congestion all in the name of "progress" and "economic development". We couldn't disagree more.</p> <p>Increased urbanization of Jackson would be a crime whether it is on the Westbank or Southpark where there is existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Please keep Teton County a sanctuary for humans and animals alike. It truly is a very special place and it would be a shame to see it destroyed by short sightedness.</p>
2/8/2012	Moyer, Robin Interested Public	<p>I have lived here off the Village Road, first in the Aspens and then on Cheney Lane, since 1981 when we first moved to the Valley. I have seen the traffic on 390 get increasing more problematic and difficult to maneuver since the expansion of Teton Village. Each time major development has occurred the loss of wildlife and the rural character of this area has suffered. The idea that has been proposed by the planners about adding more density to the Aspens area makes no sense at all. It will place an even greater burden on our road and no one wants to see a 5 lane highway leading out to Teton Village. The plan was supposed to uphold the county's scenic and wildlife values, not dump density in areas just because it "needs somewhere to land". I applaud the planning commission for their recent vote in keeping this area "Stable". The task now is to convince the electeds to reconsider this misguided proposal that would dramatically change this neighborhood, Character District 12. Please do your best in having them understand the long term wisdom of keeping any increase in residential density out of the Aspens.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	<p>Hi, Becky Tillson, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. This has been the mark of the end of your years and years of involvement. I really just wanted to thank you. I know not all of you have been involved since the beginning, but it's been a massive effort and you've been really responsive to the community and I just wanted to thank you for that. We are ?? Resolution and we're generally supportive of the direction you're giving to the electeds, but I have a couple of additional suggestions to add tonight. First, the issue of infrastructure costs, the idea of development paying its own way, was not really covered last time due to time constraints. We hope that you'll revisit that today. Our commitment to growth paying its way should be included in the introduction to the maps, and we'd just appreciate a little bit of conversation about that. Also from last time, the conversation that was called down zoning, which wasn't really an accurate representation I don't think of what the public was asking for, but that was also cut off due to time. In our view, this issues ties into the permanency of open space projection, as well as the idea of producing the overall development potential countywide, and some direction from you guys with regard to that issue would also be much appreciated. Also I'm hoping you will consider adding a statement at the beginning of the maps that clearly establishes the prioritization of wildlife and natural resources. And I know Tyler mentioned that in his presentation, but a real clear statement in there not only that ?? being balanced with the other community goals but that that's the priority. I think there's just a little bit different wording that could clarify that. Specific to the districts, looking at District 4.5, which is Karns Meadow. Again, this has to do with balancing. It would be nice if you could clarify that wildlife needs will be prioritized over recreational needs in this sensitive location. A balance right now...it says it will be balanced. I think it's fair to say they should be prioritized. In District 5.6, I'm just curious as to where the reference to mixed-use development came from, and I didn't really hear that in your conversation and maybe if you could clarify your intentions around that, that would be helpful. Also in District 5.6, I think we need to clarify the language to say that the desired development pattern is not Town-level density, but rather closer to what the existing neighborhoods around there have, so that we don't get something that's super, super dense right there. We support the move to keep the Aspens, 12.2 District, stable, not transitional. As you know, it's already an overburdened road that has significant wildlife value in the area, so we support that. Lastly, in Districts 2, 3, 4, 5, and 13, those district descriptions would benefit from additional language reaffirming the importance of wildlife permeability. Again, kind of the central goal of this Plan. This is really something that Commissioner Newcomb had mentioned last time that also kind of got cut off due to time, but many areas in our community, even in Town, are either within or adjacent to wildlife habitat and public land, but there's not a butte in a riparian area for just kind of as open space. It all provides important wildlife habitat, and development does impact that, so if we could mention wildlife permeability in development of those districts, that would be helpful. A lot of the other districts already mention it but these ones didn't. Thank you again for all of your work on this. We look forward to seeing how these changes are incorporated and I thank you very much for your service.</p>

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	<p>Gregory Griffith, West Bank. I couldn't disagree more with Mr. Pierson. This is a very intelligent demographic of public. We understand the numbers at least as well as some of the decision-makers and we should be trusted with that. I've heard elected officials recently say this isn't a numbers-based plan, it's a character-based plan. That's utter hogwash. That's a derivative of the facilitator. Every facet of planning is a derivative of a number. Even if you're looking at wildlife, you're looking at percent above or below an objective, if you're looking at vehicle miles traveled, if you're looking at capital improvement plans, population projections—everything is based on a number and we should be trusted with those. The problem with the outcry of the community is the community said from day one they didn't want additive growth because the need wasn't there, not because we're all evil misanthropic mimics. You made a mistake last week by leaving 12.1 at the Aspens as a naked node, a commercial core that will simply create inflow radial traffic. It doesn't stand alone; it's ?? should actually retake, quite frankly. There's a lot of questions brought up by individuals in the community here, Kelly and...I agree with almost everything Mr. Lockhart said, amazingly. Bill also brought up some interesting...and I'm glad some electeds are here tonight, because this illustrates how inefficient this process has been. We're still asking and attempting to answer the same questions that we did five years ago. We don't know the difference, and we haven't had the studies, and we haven't had the substantive discourse to determine what is a taking, what is a performance-based incentive, and performance-based property right. But yet we're talking about all this shifting around and we're missing the boat on the base premise of this entire Plan, sought from the beginning, and that was permanent protection for our wildlife. In working with landowners who are the stewards of that, I suggested four years ago, and continually suggested, that we have a PRD/transfer mechanism task force so that we could have simultaneously, concurrently, gathered this information, but in the infinite wisdom the electeds saw not to do that out of sheer conflict ??, not because it made sense. Someone could walk up to this podium with a grand unified theory of Teton Village planning and it would be rejected because of political considerations, etc., etc. Anthony, I think I caught the gentleman's name, brought up one of the big fears moving forward with this Plan and that's instrumentalism, that we won't hold to what we say we're going to do. We've seen it happen so often in the past that items that we write in will be selectively interpreted, etc., etc. So, there's a lot of good comments. One specific request, besides the 12.1, is glossary. Commissioner Mr. Duncker brought this up day one at your...we don't want to see permeability defined as a five-foot-wide space for a four-foot-wide moose to get through it. We want an actual community-accepted definition. Walkability would be another example. And acronyms that someone from the community mentioned also would be...You know, I brought it up last week about Staff's numbers. The overage from 6800 base property right, how do we arrive at that 11,100 number? There's about a 45 percent overage in phantom density there, and the only way to refute that is to release the numbers. There are state school sections we know are going to the Park Service. We have NC-SF, RA6, RA3 lot split that don't have a conducive historic utilization rate to equal these numbers, so it would be nice for you to direct Staff to parse those numbers out so that we can not transfer at the highest level of the scale. There's one more problem...I could go on all night...but there's one more main problem and that is the assumption that we're going to go from 40/60 to 60/40 without going through 50 percent. We're at 55/45 now. By adopting that 60/40 aspirational goal, it pins us down to operating at the high end of the number scale. Staff's draft pointed that out, their continuum of choices. The electeds ought to conform to existing policies of going to have to make those high-number choices because of an over ascribing to an aspirational goal of 60/40. Fifty percent would be well within the realm of this Plan. I honestly don't think by pulling the numbers apart that we can get there, so that's another substantive change. Thanks.</p>
2/6/2012	Lyons, Fred and Dee Interested Public	<p>We have owned property in Jackson Hole since early 1970's, first in the Aspens then over 25 years in John Dodge and now are permanent (and voting) residents in Lake Creek Ranch. All of these locations involve travel on highway 390.</p> <p>It is inconceivable that planners and officials can think about, let alone initiate plans, to increase the density of homes and especially traffic in this area. One only has to travel on the highway to understand that additional traffic is not only undesirable but also risky to wildlife, the safety of persons and the character of the area.</p> <p>We do not want to simply transfer this problem to other areas of the valley. It is an extremely bad concept looking for a place to land. ALL of this valley is a special place and should NOT be subject to urbanized plans.</p>
2/6/2012	Strawbridge, Robert Interested Public	<p>Jackson Hole is what it is because men like Albright, Roosevelt, and Rockefeller had the vision that this place had a unique combination of natural assets which should be preserved. More growth is threatening to these assets. We are here because of these unique assets and the expansionists want to expand because of them. However, expansion will endanger the very assets which attracted the expansionists and ourselves in the first place. The plan to increase density in the Aspens is only one poor growth idea. Please oppose it.</p> <p>I urge you to vote against all schemes to increase population density in our valley.</p>

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
2/5/2012	van Roijen, Bea Interested Public	<p>Please reconsider your decision to increase the density on Village Road. We do not want more housing along this corridor. Thanks for your attention.</p>
2/3/2012	Levy, Allison Interested Public	<p>I am reading the full page ad in Friday's Daily. I have to speak up because I have lived here for 25 years and fail to understand why county officials continue to think and act like real estate agents. Population has tripled since I moved here but the infrastructure to support that increase has not. Why do you continue to not think basic needs such as widening the roads such as 390 and 22 but instead push more building and concentrated populations. Don't you work with Wydot? I have no clue. But I don't get why you continue to allow building yet don't address increased traffic. There is more money in your virtual pockets to develop. We are busting at the seams. Can't anyone see that? The Aspens area is one of the last places to change the least. Put your egos aside and listen to the people. Traffic, wildlife, the RV's and Fireside resort already are a mess - then you are going to add construction workers and trucks to the equation. And isn't there enough for sale that you don't have to build more? I just don't get it. Thank you for your time. I know this won't make any difference but it helps get it off my chest how frustrated I am with how this town has grown. Its a bummer.</p>
2/2/2012	Whitmire, Bob Interested Public	<p>As I understand the goals of the community, preservation of wildlife is #1. We already have a significant problem with the slaughter of large and small animals, particularly moose, on the Village Road. The road bisects moose habitat and water sources, so movement of wildlife across the road is inevitable. No one seems to understand why the moose population seems to be declining severely. It's hard to see how the addition of 300 or 400 families in the vicinity of the Aspens and the consequent increase in traffic on the Village Road will help to preserve wildlife in general or our apparently endangered moose population in particular. I'm sure you are familiar with all of the preceding points. How do you justify the proposed build-up around the Aspens?</p>

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
2/2/2012	Harvey, Ann Interested Public	<p>I am writing once again to comment on the seemingly endless comprehensive plan process. The bottom line, I think, is that you need to ensure that the plan lives up to its lofty ideals of protecting wildlife, habitat, scenery, and the other values that define Jackson Hole. You do not do this by adding more growth, whether it's in Wilson, the Aspens, South Park, or anywhere else in the valley. The more growth the plan allows, the more fragmented and degraded wildlife habitat becomes, and the more Jackson Hole resembles all the other places where humans dominate the landscape. Please stop thinking in terms of nodes, or spots, or whatever other cancerous terms describe additive growth in Jackson Hole. We do not want or need a plan that calls for more growth. It's hard to imagine what Jackson Hole will be like with the doubling in growth that's already allowed--how can you possibly think that it's your duty to encourage even more?</p> <p>When will specific mechanisms for decreasing development in rural areas, and permanently preserving open space, be revealed to the public? Learning from the newspaper that there's a lot of "flexibility" in how 2000 potential units will be shifted from rural areas to denser areas does little to inspire confidence that this is anything more than fantasy. It's a laudable ideal to concentrate growth in the town of Jackson and decrease it in the rural parts of the valley, but until the second part of the equation is dealt with, you shouldn't be even considering additive growth anywhere in the County. After 4 years of planning, shouldn't the means of decreasing density be figured out? It's easy to allow more growth and hard to preserve open space, but taking the path of least resistance is not exactly good planning.</p> <p>I'm glad to see that the current version of the plan calls for preserving much of South Park instead of making the whole thing a density dumping ground. Please stick to this. And if any increase in density is approved for the Northwest corner, it must be clearly tied to decreasing density and permanent open space protection throughout the rural areas of South Park. The map descriptions should affirm this and be consistent with the plan language. No density increase should be directed to South Park until the Town has reached its infill potential. And no commercial development should be allowed in South Park.</p> <p>I am also entirely supportive of the Village Road residents who object to adding growth to the Aspens area. It just doesn't make sense to do that, given transportation and infrastructure issues, as well as wildlife values in that part of the valley.</p>
2/2/2012	Robinson, Sami Interested Public	<p>I am writing again as a very concerned citizen about the Comp. Plan. I know this is a critical time and many important decisions will be made very soon. The decisions will effect our lives for many years to come. I am asking you to not upzone the village road/aspens area. Living here for 35 years I know the wildlife that resides here. This is not a place that should be considered for increased density. The Aspens are should remain STABLE.</p>
2/2/2012	Sandvig, Louisa Interested Public	<p>My name is Louisa Sandvig, I live in Tucker Ranch off the Village Rd.</p> <p>I am very concerned about your desire to increase the density around the Aspens for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.If you increase density, you will have to enlarge the Village Rd., which is already very difficult to cross during "rush hours" around 8:00am & 4:30pm. 2.More wildlife will be killed with a wider road to cross. 3.More wildlife will be disturbed with more traffic & people. 4.More retail development on the Westside would decrease Jackson's & Teton Village's retail business revenue.
		<p>If you think you need more density, I suggest keeping it in Jackson.</p> <p>Why do we need more density? Real estate sales are down, there's a lot of vacant rental space in town. What are you all thinking?</p> <p>Please pay heed to those of us who live on the Village Rd. We DON'T NEED OR WANT MORE DENSITY in the Aspens or around the Village Rd.</p>
2/2/2012	Karahadian, Kathy Interested Public	<p>Please do not upzone these neighborhoods in order to create more density. I moved here 23 years ago from California to escape the onslaught of development.</p> <p>The village road cannot support any more traffic than is already there. The wildlife will never survive it and neither will the character of our neighborhoods!</p>

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
2/1/2012	Gilmore, John Interested Public	Simply, be careful! I live in John Dodge, and drive 389 daily, and wouldn't look forward to more traffic and/or a 4-lane road. I have always thought (a 22-year resident) that the density should be mostly in town, with high-rises if necessary. Save the views for rural areas. A hard job - good luck.
2/1/2012	Winder, Philip Interested Public	Please keep the Aspens and the West Bank open and do not allow the natural beauty of our valley to be overdeveloped. Listen to the voice of the people who elected you. No new housing in the Aspens and do not allow more density and development in the neighborhood.
2/1/2012	Huff, Mercedes Interested Public	Thank you for taking the time to read this letter and listen to my comments. I know this has been an arduous process and it's close to the end – which is why it is SO critical to get it right and not ruin our precious valley.
		I am writing to you today because there is a strong inclination on the part of some of you to increase the density in the area of the Aspens by 300+ residential units. That is not to say that I'm not enormously concerned about the Valley as a whole. This same thinking will be replicated in other areas of the Valley. The product of four years of planning was given to you last March and you overturned what the public had so strongly asked for. Through many public hearings and letters written to planning commissioners it was agreed that the idea of upzoned "nodes" was not the direction the people of Teton County wanted to go. But lo and behold, you decided to do that anyway. Under the guise of preserving wildlife, you're proposing to remove people's property rights in the more rural areas by downzoning them and transferring those development rights to these "nodes" or "character districts" which will become very dense towns of their own. I can't think of anything less in keeping with the character of the valley. How can you take away someone's property rights (without guaranteeing any permanent protection of those areas for open space) and then shove them into another area where they aren't wanted?
		The basic problem here is that too much density is being created. The 1994 Comprehensive Plan had a population cap which most people have expressed they would like to see DECREASED. What this New Plan proposes to do will actually INCREASE development.
		Much of the vitality of our community comes from the protective feelings so many of us share for this very special place. We didn't choose to live in a place that could become like Park City, Vail or the like. I strongly encourage you to keep Jackson Hole STABLE, to resist the urge of some planners to transition this Valley into a more urban community. This is an absolutely critical time, because this kind of error and bad planning will have disastrous results that can't be undone.
		Some might ask why, as a real estate broker, I am opposing this dense development. THE ANSWER IS SIMPLE – IT'S THE RIGHT THING TO DO. LESS IS MORE!
2/1/2012	Fossel, Scott Interested Public	Unless you can First show what the huge increase in the Aspens will look like AND address current traffic congestion on the Moose Wilson Road, I strongly urge you to STOP further development. With development already underway at Teton Village, we do not have the capacity to add to the Aspens.
2/1/2012	Leet, Melissa and Ken Interested Public	I am writing to say that I strongly oppose any increase in the Aspens area. We are new to Jackson. We chose it as our community because we appreciated that it wasn't overly built-out in the way that most mountain communities have become. Significantly increasing development would erode its character and its beauty.

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
1/31/2012	Scott, Mary Gibson Grand Teton National P	<p>In June 2011, the Teton County Board of Commissioners and the Jackson Town Council formally adopted the Jackson - Teton County Comprehensive Plan. This action was the result of years of hard work by you, your staff, and many others, and we appreciated the opportunity to provide our own comments on issues relevant to Grand Teton National Park. We commend you on this important achievement and are pleased that the Plan includes numerous references to the importance of coordinating with local federal land managers.</p> <p>While the Comprehensive Plan identified common values, principles, policies, and strategies for achieving the communities' goals, the next step is to identify more specifically how development will be directed in particular areas. The Illustration of Our Vision phase that is currently underway therefore seeks to define the character of 15 individual districts within the Town of Jackson and Teton County. We have reviewed the draft Illustration of Our Vision document and found that it is consistent with and respectful of the resources and values of Grand Teton National Park. We are particularly appreciative of efforts to maintain wildlife movement corridors in areas where it is appropriate to do so.</p> <p>As you continue moving forward with the planning effort, and in other related efforts such as revising the Natural Resources Overlay and the land development regulations, we ask that you continue to be mindful of the potential effects of decisions on Grand Teton National Park. Development on the west side of the Snake River along the Wyoming 390 corridor (Teton Village, Aspens, and Wilson) is of particular importance because of the potential to adversely affect the Moose - Wilson Road corridor within the park. This corridor contains some of the most rich and sensitive wildlife habitat within Grand Teton National Park, and is highly valued for its primitive values, opportunities for wildlife viewing, and access to the Laurance S. Rockefeller Preserve. The rustic, narrow, and winding character of the Moose - Wilson Road, and the relatively slow travel speeds are key to enjoyment of this area. Traffic volumes, however, are rapidly approaching levels that will diminish the quality of visitors' experience, and are likely not sustainable. Future growth on the Wyoming 390 corridor, as well as transportationrelated actions may significantly impact the park and should be carefully considered by planners and decision makers.</p> <p>We also note that Character District 15, the County Periphery, includes agricultural lands and open space that are adjacent to or within the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park. We appreciate that the draft Illustration of Our Vision document states that the areas within the County periphery will remain rural in character, that open space will be preserved, and wildlife habitat and movement corridors will be protected and enhanced. These policies, along with the criteria describing development in the Buffalo Valley and Kelly areas are consistent with NPS goals for management of adjacent park lands. As the planning process continues to move forward, we would appreciate the opportunity to provide input on how the land development regulations and Natural Resource Overlay can be used as tools for protecting park resources and values where development on inholdings or adjacent lands is a concern.</p> <p>We appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments and look forward to continued coordination on planning and development decisions that have cross-boundary implications. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please feel free to contact me or Management Assistant Gary Pollock at (307) 739-3411 or 739-3428.</p>
1/30/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	<p>A nice result Thursday and a nice article today (attached).</p> <p>But we are just getting started. Semper vigilis, or whatever the proper spelling should be.</p> <p>Peter</p>

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
1/27/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	<p>Thanks to all of you who showed up at the County/Town meeting last night. Very productive and most appreciated!</p> <p>There were many who spoke for the public. The only speaker who strongly supported the Staff and "nodes" was Bill Collins, the private planner who had been the County planning director.</p> <p>There is something very important to remember there, particularly for people in South Park and the Village Road area, relating to Teton County government ownership when combined with its up-zoning power, and the inherent conflict of interest. That is the current situation with the 5 acre Rains parcel next to the Aspens, which is owned by the County Housing Authority. The Rains parcel has one unit of density and the recorded plat prohibits subdivision. Yet County Staff would ignore that restriction, with a vast up-zoning.</p> <p>When Bill Collins was planning director, the County Housing Authority contracted to buy South Park acreage from Roger Seherr-Thoss. The County's initial plan was to up-zone for commercial plus 350 to 400 residences, even though the Plan's normal clustering rules only permitted a small fraction of that residential density with no commercial. The County kept trying to justify the very high land cost of this "New Neighborhood" project so the up-zoning target kept going up and up, eventually to 1,100 residential units plus commercial. County consultants even pushed for 1,400 units to justify costs. The deal later cratered, and the County forfeited its \$350,000 earnest money deposit. South Park -- and Jackson Hole -- could have become far more urban with that up-zoning.</p> <p>Anyway, just by way of perspective. Not too different than what some County people want on the Rains property. A terrible precedent for all of us, due to the inherent, extreme conflict of interest which can exist when ownership and zoning power are both in government hands.</p> <p>If an individual County Commissioner used his or her power in government to up-zone their own land, that would be an egregious conflict of interest. Is it really okay for the County government to do the same thing on the Rains parcel? I do not think so, and hopefully we can all be united on this point.</p>

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	<p>Gregory Griffith, West Bank. Five years, five hundred thousand dollars plus, 105 meetings plus. Are we really better off than we were five years ago? I say not. We've got so much of the big substantive discussions we need to have. We keep putting it off, we keep putting it off, it's at the next phase, it's at the next phase. Everyone pretty much acknowledges outside the ?? the psychology of the economy. I got into this process for one reason and one reason only, acknowledging that wildlife and open space. We can't have any substantive long-term beneficial or benefit to our wildlife without protecting more of the habitat they need to not only migrate but to move around on a daily fashion. We can't do that without permanent protection. This Plan is just completely turned on its ear from a permanent protection perspective. Everything hinged in early days on two issues primarily—affordable housing and the PRD, because without the clustering incentives, without some dedicated funding source, without a myriad or a mountain of some methodology to create this open space and to keep it...to perpetuate this little song of stewardship we have, everything else falls by the wayside. We can't do that without ?? Several people have spoken to this issue already. The ?? isn't about anything other than preventing the additive growth without having that ??, that nexus. To add to growth anywhere in the County cannot be achieved without permanent reduction elsewhere, or else we will end up essentially with the four horsemen of the overdevelopment apocalypse and that is density, sprawl, increased verticality, and the one nobody talks about, concentric expansion, which is exactly what's occurring now because they proposed expansion in the Aspens and in Northern South Park. It's absolutely ludicrous. I have a specific suggestion. I also count on Staff's numbers. It'd be nice if you guys would parse out the 4300 overage in the 6800 base entitlement and how that was arrived at. We were originally told the max PRD potential is 2900. I'd really like to see that parsed out, that number, that 4300 number that gets us to 11.1. A specific suggestion would be to eliminate...of the four categories, only have transitional and preservation. That's what people understand and most people think now that stable doesn't mean stable, it's simply the holding pattern for you'll be transitional next. So, if we're really serious about that, let's just have two categories—transitional and preservation. And that includes small town, community character, wildlife, scenic resources—the preservation of everything. There's been a stunning lack of acknowledgement throughout this process about amount of growth. Amount of growth is much more important in a constrained environment in which we live than location of growth. A lot of planners and architects, I understand all these principles as well as you guys do. I'd have that discussion with anybody in the room. In the constrained footprint that we're under, a lot of these new urbanistic and smart-growth principles have diminishing returns. That's not my opinion, that's actual data analysis. The quintessentially high and low development, sea of wilderness in public lands, assuredly as we're ??, we are constrained and islands have carrying capacities. They have carrying capacity both on qualitative and a quantitative standpoint, but we need to acknowledge that. The amount of growth is more important to the majority of the populace than location of growth. We should have adhered to the better-not-bigger premise and work with an existing footprint. Six point six million square feet, we're acknowledging a lack of critical thinking and critical problem-solving ability, if we can't work within that footprint. Six point six million square feet of commercial outstanding and 6800 base entitled units, especially in this economic time, we should be able to work within that footprint. There's also a lack of acknowledgement about the cost of growth. We keep projecting these growths, this growth and this growth pattern without considering a strong linkage to the cost of growth; most prominent among those are commercial and employee generation rates and our inability to house them where we want to, and that contribution to the commuter rate also should be considered.</p>

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Boll, George, A. Interested Public	<p>My wife and I have been coming to Jackson and Grand Teton National Park almost every year since approximately 1994 when we first came and fell in love with the area. We have on occasion brought family and friends and now also bring the newest addition to our little family, our daughter Gabi. We have also talked up the area and know for a fact that many of our friends have taken our advice and took an initial trip, also fell in love, and have since often returned with their families and friends. Unfortunately, our disclosure to others of our love for such a beautiful area, blessed with comparably wonderful people, may also have contributed to the beginning of its undoing. Specifically, we have noticed over the past years what seems to us to be a tremendous increase in traffic along the Teton Village road and along the Moose-Wilson road into the park with commensurate road kill and other deleterious effects as a result. Some of this is likely due to close access the roads present to the newly opened Laurance Rockefeller Preserve Center. However, we have also seen significant development along the Teton Village road since our first exposure to the area which must also be significantly contributing to the increase traffic. We were therefore very concerned to read of the proposal to open up the area to even more development. Certainly, there must be long term plans already in place that when originally drawn up were forward looking with regard to future development yet balanced with restrictions to achieve the laudable goal of protecting what makes the area so special. If so, my family, friends and I would ask that due weight be given thereto so as to not further destroy the beauty, serenity and habitat for wildlife this area has historically provided. Progress coupled with development can be a good thing for business and community. However, depending upon location and scale, and if left unchecked, it can also be terribly destructive with diminishing returns to all but those who profit thereby. In this case, my family, friends and I fear allowing up to 500 additional homes is more the latter than the former and, if allowed, would truly benefit only a privileged few to the detriment of the many. I hope that you will listen to this learned voice from Texas who lives in a vast sea of homes and businesses. There is a reason we come to places like Jackson. Reasons that make it special. The more it grows to look like where we live, crowded and full of rooftops blocking the view and access to the mountains, the less likely we are all to return. Memories are usually more clear closer in time to the events to be recollected. Deference should be given to the planning visionaries who initially must have sought reasonable restrictions upon development along the Teton Village road undiluted by the following years of change. We pray you will keep the area special for yourselves and your out of state friends and restrict such further development accordingly.</p>
1/26/2012	Parker, Lizbeth, and Sean Interested Public	<p>Our family has been visiting Jackson Hole regularly for over twenty years. We have made good friends with Ken & Sherrie Jern, and stay with them at the Wildflower Inn whenever we come to visit. When we come to Jackson, we love to observe the abundant wildlife (often from the deck of our room at the Wildflower Inn!), spend time on the Snake River with one of the excellent Westbank Angler guides, hike and bike in the national park, and dine at the Snake River Grill as well as Jackson's other fabulous restaurants. Together, we have climbed the Grand Teton, and Sean has summited other peaks in the Teton Range with Ken. But most importantly, we enjoy spending time in Jackson to get away from the increasingly crowded front range of Colorado. While the front range continues to experience unfettered growth, with the increasing traffic, density, infrastructure, strip malls, noise and crowds that go along with it, we appreciate each time we visit the quieter, more spacious environs of Jackson. We enjoy spending time not only with our friends Ken & Sherrie, but also enjoy experiencing the wonder of the Tetons and Jackson in a less crowded, less congested, and less hurried environment.</p> <p>We wanted to write to let you know that in our opinion, any additional building, beyond what is envisioned by the 1994 Comprehensive Plan would have a very negative impact on our perception of Jackson Hole as a place we love to spend time. Adding 500 more homesites along the Village Road, above and beyond the 7,000 still available in the County, seems excessive, and would almost certainly negatively impact the fabric of the community we have come to know and love. Unlike in Colorado, we feel that Jackson planners have done an excellent job of keeping unnecessary growth at bay over the past twenty years. The additional growth would certainly impact wildlife and the already-congested Moose-Wilson Road, and would undoubtedly bring the general noise level up considerably. These negative effects would certainly make us think twice about continuing to consider Jackson our second home, and we would be less likely to plan regular vacations there from our home in Colorado. In short, we love to come to Jackson precisely because it is not the front range of Colorado, and doesn't have Colorado's increasing traffic, density and sprawl; we would hate to see what we love and appreciate about Jackson coming to an end.</p> <p>Thank you for considering our thoughts on the proposal for additional growth beyond the 1994 Comprehensive Plan, and please feel free to contact either of us if you would like to discuss our thoughts further.</p>

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	<p>Hi, I'm Becky Tillson, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. I wanted to start by thanking all of you guys for the enormous amount of time you've served the last couple of years. <<inaudible>>. So, thank you for all of that. Trevor covered earlier some of our most comprehensive ?? Those are also included in our written comments. I wanted to give just a couple of specific suggestions about the maps, district map on the ?? section. Overall, in the introduction, there needs to be a statement that clearly establishes the prioritization of wildlife and natural resources, which in this Plan is the well-documented will of the community. As we did for Buffalo Valley, it should be clear that choosing a goal of housing or workforce or whatever should not trump the top priority of wildlife protection. Also, in the introduction, the definition of conservation area should be clarified that we will not only be reducing impacts of development but actually the overall development potential in the area as well. And lastly—I think Greg mentioned this earlier—there needs to be a clear consideration of commercial development potential throughout the County ?? the need for housing and the amount and type of commercial development that works with ?? districts. Specific to the districts, there's just a couple of other things. In Districts #2 and 4, I think it would be important to clarify that Flat Creek enhancements are not only social but also <<inaudible>>. In District 2, we do agree that <<inaudible>>, but I just wanted to point out right now that we don't believe it's appropriate for the ?? to extend into District 4 unless it's really explicitly limited to existing nonconforming uses. District 5, <<inaudible>>. I think...I just wanted to make it clear that the idea is not to give an up zone in Northern South Park without first trying to do it elsewhere. It is a good idea to continue the discussion on linking development in this area to the growth management plan, and perhaps a solution maybe is to have linkage to the growth management plan include the caveat allowing for development that's associated with permanent open space protection ?? In District 6, I think I mentioned that it would be important to clarify that further subdivision should not be encouraged. District...the River Bottom District mentions ?? and I think that should be included in the Town and County Periphery districts as well. In #10, the wildlife corridors that was mentioned, that Rich was talking about, east/west, are important to point out. High-density development in the Aspens, which is an area with high wildlife values and existing road kill problems and transportation problems, as you all know, is not consistent with the goals of this Plan...high-density development in the Aspens is not consistent with the goals of the Plan. We don't know exactly how ?? is slated for that area, but it makes sense to really minimize that ?? In the Village, this new change that we've been talking about, about not increasing beyond the established footprint, we think it's a good idea, but we prefer to see the amount and type of that future growth. ?? development that will generate markets rather than ?? is really inappropriate. The balance of convenience commercial and workforce residential housing could be explored but only with some analysis of the <<inaudible>>. As we change the subdistrict lines, people should be able to maintain the rural character of that gateway area, preserving the rural character ?? really explicit having a change around the lines there. That's too much and I just wanted to thank you guys again for your years of service and ?? Thank you.</p>

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Jern, Sherrie and Ken Interested Public	<p>I would like to specifically address the upzoning issue in Raintree.</p> <p>Ken and I moved from Vail, Colorado because we could not afford to own a home in Vail on our ski instructor and Outward Bound wages. (We lived and worked there for 10 years.) But we saved enough money to relocate to Jackson in 1976. We bought a lot in the Aspens for \$17,000. We designed our own house, cut down the logs, hauled them out of the woods. We built this house by hand and by ourselves. We had one daughter, born and raised in Jackson. She now lives in Corvallis, Oregon where she is a teacher and has saved her money and last summer bought a house...on her own.</p> <p>In 1988, we sold our home in the Aspens and bought Lot 13 in the Raintree Subdivision, where the zoning was one home per 3 acres. We again built and designed a log house. We have invested all of our money and ourselves into this land and house.</p> <p>We purchased this lot because of the rural lifestyle and the wonderful neighbors up and down the village road. This is home. We love the abundant wildlife, the trees, the water, the quiet. This area is a special spot with horses, sheep, goats, chickens, barns and buckrail fences in addition to moose, both mule and white tail deer, fox and coyotes. The great horned owls, eagles and birds are numerous.</p> <p>When the new Sally Rains Subdivision was finalized, it stated on the Plat Map that "This Subdivision Shall Not Be Subject To Further Subdivisions"</p> <p>This was stated on the Map even with all of the principals knowing that the County would purchase 5 acres in this subdivision through the Housing Authority in a two week time period for the very purpose of up zoning it for affordable housing in the future. Not only did the County pay far more than the appraised value of this land, but they stated that it was for "Land Banking" Although records clearly show much discussion by Christine Walker in regards to future affordable housing on this land. (Staff Report February 13, 2007-)</p> <p>County buys the Land and then later the County upzones it to suit their vision.</p> <p>Not our vision. Not the vision of the majority of nearby residents. When we retire, we will not be able to afford our home. And we probably will not be able to own a home in Jackson again. That is our problem, not our neighbors, not yours....but ours.</p> <p>We believe that there is enough growth built into the 1994 Comp Plan. We do not need more. We do not need to ruin our neighborhoods anywhere in the Valley. We do not need to change the lifestyle of families who have lived here for 30 years or more. We do not need or want the change. We have something that the rest of the world envies. We do not need to become them.</p> <p>Planners want to plan....you went to school for this. But sometimes, things are best left alone.</p> <p>Hi my name is Sherrie Jern and this will be a little more personal. To kind of keep up with what Peter was talking about, <<inaudible>>. We had many developers coming to us before the County purchased this property, wanting to develop it but realizing there wasn't our support and the support of other neighbors that ???. And we basically all said, no, we don't support development on this five acres. And so these developers went away. They decided that they couldn't do it without the support of the neighbors there. So, we finally sold the five acres to the County. We knew that the County was purchasing this land and that they would up zone it. They were purchasing it in order to zone it for density with disregard really to what the neighbors want. By putting a lot of density on this property, you're going to affect the entire Village Road. We're going to have congestion. Our wildlife is not going to have as much room to roam. A lot of times I feel like you're looking at these services at the Aspens, this little market, which is extremely expensive, is not a neighborhood market. No one's going to be going there and doing their weekly shopping. There's still going to be a lot of traffic going into Town. So on the really small, personal, out-of-neighborhood ranches, a development here is going to be detrimental to the entire Village Road. And also I think it's kind of expensive to the County. When I got all the minutes from the meetings, it talked about affordable housing before it was zoned, and yet on the plat now it says that this property couldn't be subdivided any further. We all knew that was going to happen and I think that's where you're going, and we don't want it. Thank you.</p>
1/26/2012	Jern, Sherrie Interested Public	

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Huff, Mercedes Interested Public	I am Mercedes Huff and I have been a full-time resident for the last four years and I've sold real estate for the last 33 or plus years, and I have to say that one of the things that made my job so enjoyable is that I've always been proud to show off our Valley and talk about how responsibly it's been planned and how it will be maintained with the same stewardship in the years to come. Right now, I think that's being threatened; I don't feel that way. I think it's critical that we, you know, keep its unique value or we're just going to be Park City, ??, Aspen, and even Sun Valley. It's a huge thing that we're looking at here and I'm very, very concerned. I was standing here tonight talking on my own personal behalf but also for the Teton Village Road Coalition, which has been recently formed to...so that we can get a group voice out here to you. I've not addressed this board before. I have talked to the County Commissioners and written letters. You know, I just don't feel that it's been heard, so I feel...we all feel that, as a group, we hopefully can have a stronger voice. There are a lot of people obviously who couldn't get here tonight; either they're out of Town or the weather prevented it. But I would ask the same question I've asked the County Commissioners and everyone else—Why are we here? Why are you insisting...or why are they insisting on completely redoing this Comprehensive Plan? And as you've been reminded many times, the mandate was to make ??, not to completely rewrite this Plan, not an overhaul. When I first asked one of the planners years ago why we had to come up with such overarching rules and new concepts for these density nodes, I was told it was too cumbersome in its current form to have to ask for variances whenever a property owner might want to do something a little outside of what was currently permitted. What could be more cumbersome, expensive, stressful than what we've all, whether Staff, Commissioners, or the populace at large, have experienced over the last four to five years? Personally, I think the variance method was a terrific built-in checks and balance system. Neighborhoods got input and there were no overarching node themes or character districts to ruin large slots of the Valley. I'm very troubled by the concept of down zoning the rural areas and transferring that to proposed nodes. That seems to be a taking—I'm not an attorney—but it seems to be down zoning these landowners. The right to cluster on larger parcels and receive some density bonus in return has been a part of the Plan for a long time and it has real, real value to an owner. How can we just remove that right and tell the owner he now has to shift it to a node? Although my concerns are really about our Valley as a whole and how the vision you're contemplating seems very flawed and very detrimental to people and wildlife, I'd like to address one specific area, and it's been brought up tonight, and it is the five-acre parcel, which the Housing Authority bought on a gamble, with taxpayer money, that it would get up zoned. And they borrowed money, which I am...my understanding is it's against the rules for a public Housing Authority. Totally inappropriate and I hope you won't give any consideration for new zoning based on that and it shouldn't be a reason for you to contemplate adding enormous density to the Aspens. That would only be rewarding bad behavior and I think we've seen too much of that in the last few years...I think a lot of it. Thank you very much.
1/26/2012	Robinson, Sami Interested Public	I'm Sami Robinson and I'm a member of that Village Road Coalition as well and the ???. I've been a resident of the Aspens for 35 years and I've seen firsthand the impact of continued growth and development in Town on the Village Road in the wildlife corridor. The Village Road should be the last place to consider up zoning and growth, adding growth. The wildlife trailer actually sits right in the middle of where you all are talking about adding growth, saying, caution wildlife crossing. And it's very unique, prime wildlife habitat. The idea of nodes has been met with complete resistance from all the residents. People don't want urbanization of that and lose our small community character. The increased density and up zoning in Teton Village Road should be eliminated from the Comp Plan. And I thank you. Consider that the moose are really important to all of us. Thank you.
1/25/2012	Rogers, Marcia & Beryl Interested Public	We are visitors to your wonderful area and it has been brought to our attention that you have plans for more homes in the area of the Moose Wilson Road. We have been coming to Jackson and the Tetons for over fourteen years. We come to get away from congestion and the city atmosphere. We have loved the Moose Wilson Road area and the thoughts of more over priced homes does nothing for us. The wildlife will suffer and the God given beauty of the area will be gone overnight. Please I beg you to leave the area as it is...you have plenty of homes and entertainment already there. Let us enjoy the peace and beauty that you have without more clutter. When we this country ever learn that some things simply need to be left alone!!!!
1/24/2012	Robinson, Sami Interested Public	I am writing for myself and my neighbors in the Aspens first filling. We are absolutely opposed and appalled by the recent information on up zoning the village road near the Aspens. We have been attending meetings and plan to speak on Thursday evening. This is a very inappropriate place for up zoning. It is obvious this is where the wild life habitat is. Many animals have been killed this winter already without the up zoning. We urge you to not proceed and listen to the residents. This should not even be considered as an area for more development.

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
1/24/2012	Swift, Phelps Interested Public	<p>Dear Ben,</p> <p>Your inflammatory remarks in last week's newspaper deserve a response. Peter Moyer was speaking on behalf of himself and other Village Road residents ... the stakeholders who have lived, worked, and raised their families in the Aspens/Teton Pines district. Peter's comments are not "from afar;" rather, his comments are from the ground and have widespread support from his Village Road neighbors.</p> <p>To the contrary, you are attempting to engineer our neighborhood "from afar" by imposing your ivory tower, closed door planning ideas on us and our neighborhood. Our neighborhood works and we wish to preserve its character.</p> <p>The Village Road residents have dutifully followed your process by attending numerous public meetings and writing comments over the past four years. I personally attended at least five (5) public hearings, three (3) workshops, and wrote a letter dated June 8, 2009 which is attached. Nothing has changed and my comments, questions, and suggestions are still applicable today.</p> <p>The "node" up-zone was soundly rejected and has now been revived by the release of the character maps. Its new name is "transition area". No matter what the label, it still spells TURMOIL.</p> <p>During the overheated real estate bubble, the Housing Authority panicked and recklessly speculated on land. Its purchase of the Rain's parcel, at twice its appraised value in 2006, once only looked foolish ... but now appears to have been illegal. Those bad land deals have costs the tax payers millions and violated the public trust. It is not reasonable to try to vindicate bad investments by dumping density with the stroke of a pen.</p> <p>For obvious reasons, I have not been invited to your private planning meetings. Your grand experiment to dump density into a single-family platted subdivision is ill founded, unfair, and destructive. See you at the public hearings.</p> <p>Thanks for your consideration.</p>
1/23/2012	Springer, Kim Interested Public	<p>I'm writing you to protest new plans for growth and development along and at the end of Highway 390. I understand several of you are in favor of growth in these areas which seems astonishing. As residents of Jackson Hole we have a unique opportunity and responsibility to help protect the National Lands at our County boundaries. Wilson and the West Bank also happen to be below the level of the Snake River. From a safety standpoint, it makes no sense to add development in just the place scientists predict to be "ground zero" if the river floods. This is not to mention grim predictions of earthquakes and floods from world renowned geologists, hydrologists and other scientists.</p> <p>Mary Gibson Scott, Superintendent of Grand Teton National Park has communicated the Park's resource concerns to the County Planners. She says "Development on the west side of the Snake River along the Wyoming 390 corridor (Teton Village, Aspens, and Wilson development nodes) is of particular importance because of the potential to adversely affect a portion of the Moose-Wilson Road within the Park as well as important wildlife habitat and movement corridors." She further points out the Moose-Wilson portion of the Park contains some of the most rich and sensitive wildlife habitat within Grand Teton National Park. Therefore she asks that transportation strategies and development decisions be sensitive to the needs of surrounding jurisdictions, including Grand Teton National Park. A wildlife rich dead-end road should be an immediate red flag for future development. As residents of Teton County we have more influence on decisions in Grand Teton than most other tax payers, even though the Park belongs to all of us. We need to help influence wise decisions for every American.</p> <p>The current Comprehensive Plan allows for plenty of new growth, 7000 units I'm told. Who can justify the need for more? It's clearly poor planning to suggest such a need without looking at the impacts and providing justification and extensive new plan and all these comments have been ignored. Who's driving this process and why? Where are all the people who want to scrap the old plan and add to growth?</p> <p>It's very hard to be supportive of a new plan while knowing the old plan's zoning and LDR's haven't held up, certainly not in our neighborhood. We need to know buildout numbers and how development in rural areas will be decreased. If this information isn't available we'll be worse off with a new plan than with the existing plan. Planning means making decisions and commitments and producing documents people can actually understand.</p>

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
1/20/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	<p>There is a basic concept which has some surface appeal, and is being pushed very aggressively by some people: move un-built density away from scenic/wildlife areas, into developed areas of Jackson Hole. Yet even an appealing theoretical concept has no mettle, until it is fully examined in its practical application, in detail, by our community. Those trying to sell the deal have been painfully short on detail. It is high time to take a common sense, informed look at the concept.</p> <p>This program would be based upon two highly sensitive matters: down-zoning in many areas, which obviously sticks in the craw of some landowners while actually limiting permanent conservation measures as well, and up-zoning in old-time Jackson Hole neighborhoods like Wilson and the Aspens, plus Teton Village, which is extremely controversial as well. You had best get it right, because you are playing with fire on all sides.</p> <p>I. Down-zoning. Most of the density transfer down-zoning would come from the elimination or reduction of the clustering/permancmt open space provisions which have been in our Comprehensive Plan for decades. Landowners receive limited density bonuses if they cluster development with permanent protected open space. Is it really such a good idea to eliminate or drastically reduce this provision? The simple answer is NO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The SRA project ended up using this concept, and the result was well over 1,000 acres of permanently protected open space. Many other landowners have done so as well. That is permanentt protection which is not subject to future political change. Unlike thepending proposal.• The clustering rights are the basis for Federal tax benefits favoring local conservation easements. Reducing or eliminating the clusterihg provisions of our Plan could have a very adverse impact on the incentive to donate future conservation easements with permanently protected, critical open space - all or part of the Federal tax benefits could disappear for potential conservation easement donors.• The existing clustering provisions can be beneficial for open space and wildlife. Moreover, the benefits and burdens are adjacent - it is not one area getting open space benefits as a result of up-zonings far away. <p>Bottom line, you would be playing with fire on the landowner rights side AND on the conservation side. Sure, there could be improvements in the existing clustering provisions of the Plan: (a) the clustering provisions should be fairer to small landowners and (b) undevelopable land (streams, wetlands, hillsides, setback areas) should not count in the density bonus formula. But minor tweaking, not wholesale change. Certainly not an excuse to up-zone elsewhere!!!</p> <p>II. Up-Zoning. Your "node" up-zoning proposals have been met with fierce resistance for over 4 years, and due to tin ears of some politicians and bureaucrats the resistance will increase, for many reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The impacted neighborhoods in Wilson, South Park, Village Road area, etc. do not want the up-zoning.• Many people throughout Jackson Hole, and many visitors to Jaclson. Hole, DO NOT WANT JACKSON HOLE URBANIZED. More traffic, more wildlife kills and other adverse impacts, more loss of our friendly small town community character.• Most of the clustering density you would transfer through up-zonings elsewhere is phantom density which would otherwise never be used. Essentially phony benefits.• The groups fighting this idea are not trying to take away landowner rights: there is no right to up-zoning. <p>••••</p> <p>The bottom line is simple. You would eliminate or reduce beneficial existing clustering rules, in a manner adverse to landowners and conservationists. Although much of the current potential clustering density would never be used, you would treat it as real build-out density and transfer it to highly developable places where it will indeed be developed. The opposite of genuine conservation because you will effectively create a lot more development! And make many people very concerned: landowners, conservationists, neighborhoods, visitors.</p> <p>The concept sounds okay on the surfac:e, but it is fundamentally flawed when one takes a realistic, hard look. A classic lose, lose.</p>

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
1/16/2012	Jern, Sherrie Interested Public	<p>Interesting headlines Monday, January 16. I have been attending meetings for over 4 years regarding how the residents of Teton County actually want the new, updated Comprehensive Plan to look. What I heard and stated at these meetings does not mesh with what the Teton County Commissioners and Planning Commissioners are quoted as wanting in this article.</p> <p>More growth at Teton Village? With more growth, it will become more like a village? Excuse me...it is Teton Village. It was more like a village prior to the Four Seasons being built.</p> <p>Where will the traffic go? Down the already crowded Highway 390? Through the underdeveloped, seasonal Moose-Wilson Road? The park will love that.</p> <p>And I believe they will close it or make it one way if traffic becomes even more congested than it is already in the summer. What happens in a disaster? I have seen the traffic backed up to our house which is north of the Aspens on busy ski days, when there is an accident near the bridge and even with accidents on 22. What happens if there is a major earthquake? How will an evacuation happen? We only have one bridge and one road 6 months of the year.</p> <p>Have you been at the intersection of Highways 22 and 390 when residents are commuting to/from work or school? Let's put more cars on the road? And believe me, there will be more cars. It is idyllic to think that it will be a self-contained "village". Even if one person is employed in the Village, you can be certain that the other will have a job in town, a class to take, a meeting to attend, a dentist appointment, a movie to see, a child to pick up from school.</p> <p>The Aspens area...ditto for the above. "Coupled with a push to allow for more residential development?" I would like to invite those persons who are pushing for more development to please write their desires here...because I did not hear their voices at the meetings I attended. I heard neighbors wanting to retain the quality of their neighborhoods, to protect wildlife and a way of life.</p> <p>More density in the Aspens area? Why? It is a congested mid-stop on a busy highway already. And just because we have a few small, local services like a neighborhood market, coffee shop, bank, dry cleaning drop off; you feel we are primed for a larger population? Or are you suggesting that we need additional new commercial development? Last I heard, we have undeveloped existing commercial lots and spaces in the Pines, the Aspens and Teton Village.</p> <p>I can see it now...a new Smith's across from the Aspens!</p> <p>Growth. It is really a good thing? Maybe it is time that we do better with what we have and stop wanting more.</p>

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
1/9/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	<p>If Save Historic Jackson Hole were allowed to participate in the "Red Dot" exercise this week, the attached list is where we would place our dots. After each dot is a brief explanation of why we would place our dots there.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•The Plan must include building and density numbers.<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦A Plan without metrics isn't a real plan.•Any density increase must be balanced with density decrease.<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦Permanent Protection of sensitive areas was and is the objective, not town growth.◦Protection of sensitive areas is what was sold to the public and the promise needs to be kept.•No Zoning changes and density transfer until a mechanism is in place.<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦With 50-70 years of growth already in the pipeline, we have time to get this right.•Protect rural character and small town atmosphere everywhere.<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦Jackson Hole is all about small town rural character; that's what we are.◦The current draft only extends this protection to the Town Square.•Eliminate contradictory and confusing definitions.<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦We can provide a list, but start with "stable" and "complete neighborhoods."•Do not encourage development in Northern South Park.<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦Infill in Town before we sprawl south.◦We do not want to refight the Porter Annexation battle.•Do not expand the Lodging Overlay.<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦The existing overlay already allows for more lodging, where's the need to make it larger? We are rarely at full occupancy now.•No Density increase in difficult/sensitive areas.<p>The following areas all have access problems and are adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. They should not see increases in density.</p><ul style="list-style-type: none">◦Between Broadway and Flat Creek in Midtown and Town Commercial Core.◦Steep hillsides at the "Y"◦Commercial development at the Aspens should not expand across 390.

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
1/23/2010	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	After attending almost all of the Comp Plan meetings and workshops over the last 4 years, myself and many other community members have come to the same conclusion: take the 1994 plan and improve and tweak it to better reflect the need to protect wildlife habitat and connectivity, keep our small town character, plan for the future already entitled growth, keep visitors coming to Jackson Hole and try to do all this in a manner that respects the environment. The Vision – Themes and Policies part of the document does an adequate job of outlining many of tweaks to the 1994 policies. The missing piece that is not clearly stated is the plan of how infrastructure improvements necessary to implement the policies will be undertaken. The updating of and expansion of infrastructure just to accommodate entitled but not yet built development is a major concern. Accurately analyzing infrastructure and their costs need to be presented to the community before policies or maps are approved. Commitments to supply infrastructure to already entitled development plus up-zonings whether located in town or the county could bankrupt our community.

Please consider the following comments specific to the Character District Chapters:

- The County

The Character District maps are vague purposefully to allow a vast amount of additive growth in a number of Districts. Too many uncertainties exist which include what will be next door, how dense, how tall, what will this do to wildlife, roads, traffic, what will it cost. The additive growth that the Character District maps show does not retain the character of Rural Jackson Hole but creates urban nodes of high densities that the community has consistently rejected. Limiting growth to infill development following existing zoning and character throughout Teton County respects existing property rights and retains what we all love about Jackson Hole. We all know and accept these numbers and feel that this is the maximum build out that can be supported. Why not keep the Character District Chapters but eliminate all additive growth? Why not adjust all incentive based tools (PRD) to attain the goals identified in the Vision (Themes and Policies) for minimizing rural and greenfield development to better protect wildlife, open spaces, yet still respect property rights? Why not make the PRD more of an individual "CUP type process"? A letter dated 1/9/2012 from the Jackson Hole Land Trust states "These incentives should be both strong and diverse, as what works for one landowner in a key habitat may not for his or her neighbor."

The concept of feathering out density to and from drastic hard line changes in density should be a consistent policy throughout all town and county districts. This has been left out of numerous districts in both town and county. One particular example is the southern area of district 12.4 where a hard line of 10 units per acre (JH Campground) back up to now a hard fast suggested change for a policy of 1 unit per acre. The specific Neighborhood Form illustration is not accurate. A general policy of minimum lot size for the area with density feathering allowances would be more appropriate for the area.

Districts along Teton Village Road.

A letter dated 6/11/2009 sent to Teton County Planning and Development from Grand Teton National Park Superintendent, Mary Gibson Scott states "Accurate build out forecasts are important to understanding future development impacts and are needed to ensure protection of wildlife, natural, and scenic resources." "Development on the west side of the Snake River along the Wyoming 390 corridor (Teton Village, Aspens and Wilson development nodes) is of particular importance because of the potential to adversely affect a portion of the Moose-Wilson Road within the park as well as important wildlife habitat and movement corridors." "Future growth on the Wyoming 390 corridor, as well as transportation-related actions, may significantly affect the park and should be carefully considered."

Review of Appendix K (page 8-54) in the Vision document anticipates a Level of Service for Highway 390 to drop from high LOS E(1996) to a High F(possibly already by 2012 as no reconstruction has occurred as was anticipated by 2004). Additional growth beyond what was planned in 1994 will further degrade the LOS below the report used in Appendix K. Any additive growth on Hwy 390 without improvements to a LOS of at least D as required by County standards is irresponsible planning.

- Town of Jackson

12: Aspens/Pines

Date Name

Comment

It is very clear that the Town of Jackson has a big growth agenda. I do not see much resistance from town residents. There is no effort to relate the amount of non-residential growth potential to what the resultant residential workforce housing needs will be based on the Character districts. Infrastructure improvements capabilities and costs must be analyzed. Will Town establish a new tax (property or sales) to pay for the massive additional and upgraded infrastructure needed for this expansion?

Again feathering changes in density from one district or even within districts is a very important policy especially with the amount of growth that town is proposing. The area of Karns Meadow and surrounding properties appears to be trying to be too many things for many non-compatible uses. Is this area to be more for a wildlife corridor or a developed city type park? Is the park to be focal point for intense commercial buildings surrounding the park? How Does the Start facility fit into all of this? I hope the choice to develop Karns Meadow into a low key more interpretive park with minimal development except a pathway is more of the approved direction.

Thank You for considering my comments at both the planning commission level and the commissioner/mayor/town council level.

13: Teton Village

Date	Name	Comment
2/27/2012	Harrington, Kathy Interested Public	<p>As I listen and talk, and travel around listening to neighbors, guests, life time residents, I continue to hear the same thing over and over. Who is the WE that wants all this up-zoning, who is the WE that can't get along with our existing plan?</p> <p>As I drove to Teton Village the night of February 8th and saw the freshly killed calf moose, I was trying, as I have been for the past 6 months to think of my comments to you all after attending one of your plan meetings, my comments began to form. It wasn't until I arrived at Shooting Star to be greeted with the foulest sewer odor, I am not kidding when I say it made my eyes run and my stomach turn. Then I went to the Mangey Moose where the smell permeated the entire building. It was disgusting.</p> <p>My comment was born. Until we upgrade our Sewers at both the Pines and the Village, and do something about the carnage and traffic on the Village road and 22 you have no business up-zoning any areas on the west bank. We have been good stewards to the HA, we have both affordable and attainable in Wilson and Teton Village. We as tax paying citizens have done enough to help provide housing. No one bought me a house, or gave me a subsidy. Enough. The people of Teton County are speaking loud and clear, we like our little county as it is, some of us can say you are all in our back yard. We were here first. There is not one property owning citizen in Teton County that deserves to have the zoning changed in or around their neighborhood.</p> <p>PLEASE KEEP THE WESTBANK STABLE.</p>
2/8/2012	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	<p>Hi, Becky Tillson, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. This has been the mark of the end of your years and years of involvement. I really just wanted to thank you. I know not all of you have been involved since the beginning, but it's been a massive effort and you've been really responsive to the community and I just wanted to thank you for that. We are ?? Resolution and we're generally supportive of the direction you're giving to the electeds, but I have a couple of additional suggestions to add tonight. First, the issue of infrastructure costs, the idea of development paying its own way, was not really covered last time due to time constraints. We hope that you'll revisit that today. Our commitment to growth paying its way should be included in the introduction to the maps, and we'd just appreciate a little bit of conversation about that. Also from last time, the conversation that was called down zoning, which wasn't really an accurate representation I don't think of what the public was asking for, but that was also cut off due to time. In our view, this issues ties into the permanency of open space projection, as well as the idea of producing the overall development potential countywide, and some direction from you guys with regard to that issue would also be much appreciated. Also I'm hoping you will consider adding a statement at the beginning of the maps that clearly establishes the prioritization of wildlife and natural resources. And I know Tyler mentioned that in his presentation, but a real clear statement in there not only that ?? being balanced with the other community goals but that that's the priority. I think there's just a little bit different wording that could clarify that. Specific to the districts, looking at District 4.5, which is Karns Meadow. Again, this has to do with balancing. It would be nice if you could clarify that wildlife needs will be prioritized over recreational needs in this sensitive location. A balance right now...it says it will be balanced. I think it's fair to say they should be prioritized. In District 5.6, I'm just curious as to where the reference to mixed-use development came from, and I didn't really hear that in your conversation and maybe if you could clarify your intentions around that, that would be helpful. Also in District 5.6, I think we need to clarify the language to say that the desired development pattern is not Town-level density, but rather closer to what the existing neighborhoods around there have, so that we don't get something that's super, super dense right there. We support the move to keep the Aspens, 12.2 District, stable, not transitional. As you know, it's already an overburdened road that has significant wildlife value in the area, so we support that. Lastly, in Districts 2, 3, 4, 5, and 13, those district descriptions would benefit from additional language reaffirming the importance of wildlife permeability. Again, kind of the central goal of this Plan. This is really something that Commissioner Newcomb had mentioned last time that also kind of got cut off due to time, but many areas in our community, even in Town, are either within or adjacent to wildlife habitat and public land, but there's not a butte in a riparian area for just kind of as open space. It all provides important wildlife habitat, and development does impact that, so if we could mention wildlife permeability in development of those districts, that would be helpful. A lot of the other districts already mention it but these ones didn't. Thank you again for all of your work on this. We look forward to seeing how these changes are incorporated and I thank you very much for your service.</p>

13: Teton Village

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	<p>Sorry, I'll be less windy...Peter Moyer from the Village Road area. Just starting at the north on the character districts—and I'm only speaking for myself—Teton Village, instead of dumping more residential density up there, it would make sense to me...what they've missed up there is having a real Village. And frankly I would love to see more really appropriate commercial zoning, so you don't just have hotbeds up there dumping into other parts of the Valley. I think it makes it a much more quality experience up there, plus in some ways it takes pressure off the roads if you do it right. So, that's one thing. The Aspens, I won't repeat, we've been through all that. I really appreciate, and I think a lot of people really appreciate, your decision when it was time for stability, which is what so many of these neighborhoods want to encourage. Wilson, it's the same thing, you know. You look at Wilson and the Aspens and in terms of creating a lot of new up-zone density in areas that are about 12 to 15 feet beneath the bed of the Snake River right on the Teton Fall just never made a whole lot of sense to a lot of us. I mean, those of us who are there, yes, it's a risk you accept, but in terms of future up-zone density for Wilson, the Aspens area just never made sense. Teton Village is much higher, it's not a problem, even though it's on the Fall. Moving down to other parts of Town, South Park, the Town, to me the key thing is sort of honoring as best you can the sort of wishes and desires of the people in those neighborhoods, so you're not just dumping density from on high from the Ivory Tower where it's really doing it right and making it comfortable for them. You look at what's gone on here and we have a pretty severe recession. What people love is stability. In hard times like this, stability is really important. So, sort of zapping neighborhoods with sort of up zoning decrees coming from on high, I just don't think it's proper at this time, plus the free market actually has been working great along those lines. There's less of a demand on the workforce, we've lost thousands of jobs, plus prices in a free market have come down dramatically. And I've always seen, and I think a lot of people see, Victor, Driggs, Alpine as being part of our community. That's part of our workforce, too, and it just seems nuts to think that by creating new up-zone density, we can compete with prices in Driggs and Alpine and areas like that where they're not deed restricted. They don't need public subsidies. The prices are low. They've got, what is it, 17,000 unbuilt lots over in Teton County Idaho in that region. You know, for us to think we can meet some artificial 65 percent workforce thing just seems crazy, common-sense wise, plus, according to the Housing Authority, the Fall 2010 Report, 68 percent of the households here in Teton County Wyoming work here. That's doing pretty good. I mean, it's really doing well right now and the market has done well as it stands right now. And the second homes, they're not the enemy. I mean, that's part of Jackson Hole. It's a big part of our economy, second homes, and to come up with some artificial workforce housing thing as the driving force to meet some artificial standards just doesn't seem to make sense and it just creates this tension where you're dumping density in neighborhoods. So, thanks, and I apologize if I went too long the last time. Thank you guys for your public service. I mean, it's really appreciated. I mean, we just sort of show up in a cameo appearance; you guys do the work. Thank you.</p>

13: Teton Village

Date	Name	Comment
1/31/2012	Scott, Mary Gibson Grand Teton National P	<p>In June 2011, the Teton County Board of Commissioners and the Jackson Town Council formally adopted the Jackson - Teton County Comprehensive Plan. This action was the result of years of hard work by you, your staff, and many others, and we appreciated the opportunity to provide our own comments on issues relevant to Grand Teton National Park. We commend you on this important achievement and are pleased that the Plan includes numerous references to the importance of coordinating with local federal land managers.</p> <p>While the Comprehensive Plan identified common values, principles, policies, and strategies for achieving the communities' goals, the next step is to identify more specifically how development will be directed in particular areas. The Illustration of Our Vision phase that is currently underway therefore seeks to define the character of 15 individual districts within the Town of Jackson and Teton County. We have reviewed the draft Illustration of Our Vision document and found that it is consistent with and respectful of the resources and values of Grand Teton National Park. We are particularly appreciative of efforts to maintain wildlife movement corridors in areas where it is appropriate to do so.</p> <p>As you continue moving forward with the planning effort, and in other related efforts such as revising the Natural Resources Overlay and the land development regulations, we ask that you continue to be mindful of the potential effects of decisions on Grand Teton National Park. Development on the west side of the Snake River along the Wyoming 390 corridor (Teton Village, Aspens, and Wilson) is of particular importance because of the potential to adversely affect the Moose - Wilson Road corridor within the park. This corridor contains some of the most rich and sensitive wildlife habitat within Grand Teton National Park, and is highly valued for its primitive values, opportunities for wildlife viewing, and access to the Laurance S. Rockefeller Preserve. The rustic, narrow, and winding character of the Moose - Wilson Road, and the relatively slow travel speeds are key to enjoyment of this area. Traffic volumes, however, are rapidly approaching levels that will diminish the quality of visitors' experience, and are likely not sustainable. Future growth on the Wyoming 390 corridor, as well as transportationrelated actions may significantly impact the park and should be carefully considered by planners and decision makers.</p> <p>We also note that Character District 15, the County Periphery, includes agricultural lands and open space that are adjacent to or within the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park. We appreciate that the draft Illustration of Our Vision document states that the areas within the County periphery will remain rural in character, that open space will be preserved, and wildlife habitat and movement corridors will be protected and enhanced. These policies, along with the criteria describing development in the Buffalo Valley and Kelly areas are consistent with NPS goals for management of adjacent park lands. As the planning process continues to move forward, we would appreciate the opportunity to provide input on how the land development regulations and Natural Resource Overlay can be used as tools for protecting park resources and values where development on inholdings or adjacent lands is a concern.</p> <p>We appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments and look forward to continued coordination on planning and development decisions that have cross-boundary implications. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please feel free to contact me or Management Assistant Gary Pollock at (307) 739-3411 or 739-3428.</p>

13: Teton Village

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	<p>Hi, I'm Becky Tillson, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. I wanted to start by thanking all of you guys for the enormous amount of time you've served the last couple of years. <<inaudible>>. So, thank you for all of that. Trevor covered earlier some of our most comprehensive ?? Those are also included in our written comments. I wanted to give just a couple of specific suggestions about the maps, district map on the ?? section. Overall, in the introduction, there needs to be a statement that clearly establishes the prioritization of wildlife and natural resources, which in this Plan is the well-documented will of the community. As we did for Buffalo Valley, it should be clear that choosing a goal of housing or workforce or whatever should not trump the top priority of wildlife protection. Also, in the introduction, the definition of conservation area should be clarified that we will not only be reducing impacts of development but actually the overall development potential in the area as well. And lastly—I think Greg mentioned this earlier—there needs to be a clear consideration of commercial development potential throughout the County ?? the need for housing and the amount and type of commercial development that works with ?? districts. Specific to the districts, there's just a couple of other things. In Districts #2 and 4, I think it would be important to clarify that Flat Creek enhancements are not only social but also <<inaudible>>. In District 2, we do agree that <<inaudible>>, but I just wanted to point out right now that we don't believe it's appropriate for the ?? to extend into District 4 unless it's really explicitly limited to existing nonconforming uses. District 5, <<inaudible>>. I think...I just wanted to make it clear that the idea is not to give an up zone in Northern South Park without first trying to do it elsewhere. It is a good idea to continue the discussion on linking development in this area to the growth management plan, and perhaps a solution maybe is to have linkage to the growth management plan include the caveat allowing for development that's associated with permanent open space protection ?? In District 6, I think I mentioned that it would be important to clarify that further subdivision should not be encouraged. District...the River Bottom District mentions ?? and I think that should be included in the Town and County Periphery districts as well. In #10, the wildlife corridors that was mentioned, that Rich was talking about, east/west, are important to point out. High-density development in the Aspens, which is an area with high wildlife values and existing road kill problems and transportation problems, as you all know, is not consistent with the goals of this Plan...high-density development in the Aspens is not consistent with the goals of the Plan. We don't know exactly how ?? is slated for that area, but it makes sense to really minimize that ?? In the Village, this new change that we've been talking about, about not increasing beyond the established footprint, we think it's a good idea, but we prefer to see the amount and type of that future growth. ?? development that will generate markets rather than ?? is really inappropriate. The balance of convenience commercial and workforce residential housing could be explored but only with some analysis of the <<inaudible>>. As we change the subdistrict lines, people should be able to maintain the rural character of that gateway area, preserving the rural character ?? really explicit having a change around the lines there. That's too much and I just wanted to thank you guys again for your years of service and ?? Thank you.</p>

13: Teton Village

Date	Name	Comment
1/20/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	<p>There is a basic concept which has some surface appeal, and is being pushed very aggressively by some people: move un-built density away from scenic/wildlife areas, into developed areas of Jackson Hole. Yet even an appealing theoretical concept has no mettle, until it is fully examined in its practical application, in detail, by our community. Those trying to sell the deal have been painfully short on detail. It is high time to take a common sense, informed look at the concept.</p> <p>This program would be based upon two highly sensitive matters: down-zoning in many areas, which obviously sticks in the craw of some landowners while actually limiting permanent conservation measures as well, and up-zoning in old-time Jackson Hole neighborhoods like Wilson and the Aspens, plus Teton Village, which is extremely controversial as well. You had best get it right, because you are playing with fire on all sides.</p> <p>I. Down-zoning. Most of the density transfer down-zoning would come from the elimination or reduction of the clustering/permancmt open space provisions which have been in our Comprehensive Plan for decades. Landowners receive limited density bonuses if they cluster development with permanent protected open space. Is it really such a good idea to eliminate or drastically reduce this provision? The simple answer is NO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The SRA project ended up using this concept, and the result was well over 1,000 acres of permanently protected open space. Many other landowners have done so as well. That is permanentt protection which is not subject to future political change. Unlike thepending proposal.• The clustering rights are the basis for Federal tax benefits favoring local conservation easements. Reducing or eliminating the clusterihg provisions of our Plan could have a very adverse impact on the incentive to donate future conservation easements with permanently protected, critical open space - all or part of the Federal tax benefits could disappear for potential conservation easement donors.• The existing clustering provisions can be beneficial for open space and wildlife. Moreover, the benefits and burdens are adjacent - it is not one area getting open space benefits as a result of up-zonings far away. <p>Bottom line, you would be playing with fire on the landowner rights side AND on the conservation side. Sure, there could be improvements in the existing clustering provisions of the Plan: (a) the clustering provisions should be fairer to small landowners and (b) undevelopable land (streams, wetlands, hillsides, setback areas) should not count in the density bonus formula. But minor tweaking, not wholesale change. Certainly not an excuse to up-zone elsewhere!!!</p> <p>II. Up-Zoning. Your "node" up-zoning proposals have been met with fierce resistance for over 4 years, and due to tin ears of some politicians and bureaucrats the resistance will increase, for many reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The impacted neighborhoods in Wilson, South Park, Village Road area, etc. do not want the up-zoning.• Many people throughout Jackson Hole, and many visitors to Jaclson. Hole, DO NOT WANT JACKSON HOLE URBANIZED. More traffic, more wildlife kills and other adverse impacts, more loss of our friendly small town community character.• Most of the clustering density you would transfer through up-zonings elsewhere is phantom density which would otherwise never be used. Essentially phony benefits.• The groups fighting this idea are not trying to take away landowner rights: there is no right to up-zoning. <p>••••</p> <p>The bottom line is simple. You would eliminate or reduce beneficial existing clustering rules, in a manner adverse to landowners and conservationists. Although much of the current potential clustering density would never be used, you would treat it as real build-out density and transfer it to highly developable places where it will indeed be developed. The opposite of genuine conservation because you will effectively create a lot more development! And make many people very concerned: landowners, conservationists, neighborhoods, visitors.</p> <p>The concept sounds okay on the surfac:e, but it is fundamentally flawed when one takes a realistic, hard look. A classic lose, lose.</p>

13: Teton Village

Date	Name	Comment
1/16/2012	Jern, Sherrie Interested Public	<p>Interesting headlines Monday, January 16. I have been attending meetings for over 4 years regarding how the residents of Teton County actually want the new, updated Comprehensive Plan to look. What I heard and stated at these meetings does not mesh with what the Teton County Commissioners and Planning Commissioners are quoted as wanting in this article.</p> <p>More growth at Teton Village? With more growth, it will become more like a village? Excuse me...it is Teton Village. It was more like a village prior to the Four Seasons being built.</p> <p>Where will the traffic go? Down the already crowded Highway 390? Through the underdeveloped, seasonal Moose-Wilson Road? The park will love that.</p> <p>And I believe they will close it or make it one way if traffic becomes even more congested than it is already in the summer. What happens in a disaster? I have seen the traffic backed up to our house which is north of the Aspens on busy ski days, when there is an accident near the bridge and even with accidents on 22. What happens if there is a major earthquake? How will an evacuation happen? We only have one bridge and one road 6 months of the year.</p> <p>Have you been at the intersection of Highways 22 and 390 when residents are commuting to/from work or school? Let's put more cars on the road? And believe me, there will be more cars. It is idyllic to think that it will be a self-contained "village". Even if one person is employed in the Village, you can be certain that the other will have a job in town, a class to take, a meeting to attend, a dentist appointment, a movie to see, a child to pick up from school.</p> <p>The Aspens area...ditto for the above. "Coupled with a push to allow for more residential development?" I would like to invite those persons who are pushing for more development to please write their desires here...because I did not hear their voices at the meetings I attended. I heard neighbors wanting to retain the quality of their neighborhoods, to protect wildlife and a way of life.</p> <p>More density in the Aspens area? Why? It is a congested mid-stop on a busy highway already. And just because we have a few small, local services like a neighborhood market, coffee shop, bank, dry cleaning drop off; you feel we are primed for a larger population? Or are you suggesting that we need additional new commercial development? Last I heard, we have undeveloped existing commercial lots and spaces in the Pines, the Aspens and Teton Village.</p> <p>I can see it now...a new Smith's across from the Aspens!</p> <p>Growth. It is really a good thing? Maybe it is time that we do better with what we have and stop wanting more.</p>

13: Teton Village

Date	Name	Comment
1/23/2010	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	After attending almost all of the Comp Plan meetings and workshops over the last 4 years, myself and many other community members have come to the same conclusion: take the 1994 plan and improve and tweak it to better reflect the need to protect wildlife habitat and connectivity, keep our small town character, plan for the future already entitled growth, keep visitors coming to Jackson Hole and try to do all this in a manner that respects the environment. The Vision – Themes and Policies part of the document does an adequate job of outlining many of tweaks to the 1994 policies. The missing piece that is not clearly stated is the plan of how infrastructure improvements necessary to implement the policies will be undertaken. The updating of and expansion of infrastructure just to accommodate entitled but not yet built development is a major concern. Accurately analyzing infrastructure and their costs need to be presented to the community before policies or maps are approved. Commitments to supply infrastructure to already entitled development plus up-zonings whether located in town or the county could bankrupt our community.

Please consider the following comments specific to the Character District Chapters:

- The County

The Character District maps are vague purposefully to allow a vast amount of additive growth in a number of Districts. Too many uncertainties exist which include what will be next door, how dense, how tall, what will this do to wildlife, roads, traffic, what will it cost. The additive growth that the Character District maps show does not retain the character of Rural Jackson Hole but creates urban nodes of high densities that the community has consistently rejected. Limiting growth to infill development following existing zoning and character throughout Teton County respects existing property rights and retains what we all love about Jackson Hole. We all know and accept these numbers and feel that this is the maximum build out that can be supported. Why not keep the Character District Chapters but eliminate all additive growth? Why not adjust all incentive based tools (PRD) to attain the goals identified in the Vision (Themes and Policies) for minimizing rural and greenfield development to better protect wildlife, open spaces, yet still respect property rights? Why not make the PRD more of an individual "CUP type process"? A letter dated 1/9/2012 from the Jackson Hole Land Trust states "These incentives should be both strong and diverse, as what works for one landowner in a key habitat may not for his or her neighbor."

The concept of feathering out density to and from drastic hard line changes in density should be a consistent policy throughout all town and county districts. This has been left out of numerous districts in both town and county. One particular example is the southern area of district 12.4 where a hard line of 10 units per acre (JH Campground) back up to now a hard fast suggested change for a policy of 1 unit per acre. The specific Neighborhood Form illustration is not accurate. A general policy of minimum lot size for the area with density feathering allowances would be more appropriate for the area.

Districts along Teton Village Road.

A letter dated 6/11/2009 sent to Teton County Planning and Development from Grand Teton National Park Superintendent, Mary Gibson Scott states "Accurate build out forecasts are important to understanding future development impacts and are needed to ensure protection of wildlife, natural, and scenic resources." "Development on the west side of the Snake River along the Wyoming 390 corridor (Teton Village, Aspens and Wilson development nodes) is of particular importance because of the potential to adversely affect a portion of the Moose-Wilson Road within the park as well as important wildlife habitat and movement corridors." "Future growth on the Wyoming 390 corridor, as well as transportation-related actions, may significantly affect the park and should be carefully considered."

Review of Appendix K (page 8-54) in the Vision document anticipates a Level of Service for Highway 390 to drop from high LOS E(1996) to a High F(possibly already by 2012 as no reconstruction has occurred as was anticipated by 2004). Additional growth beyond what was planned in 1994 will further degrade the LOS below the report used in in Appendix K. Any additive growth on Hwy 390 without improvements to a LOS of at least D as required by County standards is irresponsible planning.

- Town of Jackson

13: Teton Village

Date Name

Comment

It is very clear that the Town of Jackson has a big growth agenda. I do not see much resistance from town residents. There is no effort to relate the amount of non-residential growth potential to what the resultant residential workforce housing needs will be based on the Character districts. Infrastructure improvements capabilities and costs must be analyzed. Will Town establish a new tax (property or sales) to pay for the massive additional and upgraded infrastructure needed for this expansion?

Again feathering changes in density from one district or even within districts is a very important policy especially with the amount of growth that town is proposing. The area of Karns Meadow and surrounding properties appears to be trying to be too many things for many non-compatible uses. Is this area to be more for a wildlife corridor or a developed city type park? Is the park to be focal point for intense commercial buildings surrounding the park? How Does the Start facility fit into all of this? I hope the choice to develop Karns Meadow into a low key more interpretive park with minimal development except a pathway is more of the approved direction.

Thank You for considering my comments at both the planning commission level and the commissioner/mayor/town council level.

14: Alta

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Fuller, Lee and Jim Wov Interested Public	<p>We live in the Forest Edge subdivision in Alta and are for the proposed extension of State Line Road for the following reasons: 1) We have 7 children who need to ride a school bus to the Alta School.</p> <p>2) Fire protection and other emergency vehicles</p> <p>3) Utility vehicles</p> <p>These are all ESSENTIAL reasons, not frivolous nor indulgent reasons.</p> <p>Thank you for all your hard work and devoted time on behalf of the citizens of Teton County, Wyoming.</p>
1/26/2012	Moore, Steve, R Interested Public	<p>In 2003 I purchased property in Forest Edge Subdivision north of Alta. At the time, I was informed improvements were being done on Stateline Road, and within two years the South Leigh Creek crossing would be re-established. Since that time I have built an affordable and highly efficient home there, and now commute to my job at Grand Teton N.P.</p> <p>Co-workers live in the Alta and Ski Hill Road area, and should Stateline connect, the opportunity to carpool would be significantly enhanced. The current situation leaves me feeling somewhat disconnected from my community in that what would be a short bicycle ride or walk to visit friends and neighbors, or join up to commute, is now a lengthy and hazardous trip involving travel to and down Highway 33. It seems these issues would be resolved if the following Policies of the Comprehensive Plan were to be fully implemented. I would like to be on record as being strongly opposed to any alteration or interpretation of the plan that would not include a timely completion of Stateline Road connecting the South Leigh Area with the rest of the Alta community. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.</p> <p>Policy 7.2.a: Create a transportation network based on “complete streets” and “context sensitive” solutions</p> <p>The Town and County will adopt and implement “complete street” and “context sensitive” roadway design standards. The construction of complete streets and context sensitive roadways will serve as the backbone for a community wide transportation network that supports a significant mode shift to alternative transportation. To achieve the community’s transportation vision, improvements should safely accommodate all users of the public right-of-way, including: pedestrians, bicyclists, automobile drivers, trucks and transit riders. Public safety and reduction of crashes and fatalities (motor vehicle, bike, pedestrian, and wildlife) is a core transportation goal to be considered in the application of all strategies.</p> <p>Policy 7.2.b: Interconnect all modes of transportation</p> <p>Our alternative transportation system will provide a means to connect all alternative modes of travel. Park ‘n’ Rides, bicycle parking, complete streets, transit, and pathways will be incorporated into an integrated alternative transportation system. A system of trails to connect our parklands and trailheads should be considered as part of the transportation system. The Town and County will work jointly to identify opportunities for connections between various alternative transportation modes.</p> <p>Policy 7.2.c: Maximize interconnection, redundancy and hierarchy in the transportation network</p> <p>The development of an interconnected and redundant network is critical to the assurance of a safe, efficient and complete transportation system. In the event that a road or bridge is closed due to a natural hazard or other event, interconnection and redundancy will ensure continued access between and within locations in the community. It will be important to strike a balance between adding new roads and widening existing roads to provide for this community need. The Town and County will consider the need for interconnection, redundancy, and hierarchy when planning for an integrated transportation network.</p> <p>Policy 7.3.a: Develop a land use pattern based on transportation connectivity</p> <p>A goal of this plan is to interconnect existing County neighborhoods and the Town of Jackson with a multimodal transportation system. Within existing County and Town complete neighborhoods, alternative modes of transportation are viable for daily trips year-round, and these opportunities should be maintained and enhanced. Outside of complete neighborhoods the Town and County will promote a land use pattern that supports alternative transportation by requiring interconnectivity of future developments and existing development to the best extent possible.</p>
1/26/2012	Kane, Raye and Jim Interested Public	<p>As ten-year residents of Forest Edge and taxpayers of Teton County, Wy we strongly support language in the Character District Maps connecting State Line Road across South Leigh Creek. We drive an additional 20 miles a day to get to Targhee. Same with our school children attending Alta School. Services are not available to us simply because we are not connected; such as, dust coating our roads and regular road maintenance. We oppose any change in the language that might prevent these improvements to State Line Road. We have been waiting a long time. Please do not sidetrack this plan. Thank you.</p>

14: Alta

Date	Name	Comment
1/25/2012	Monroe, Allen Interested Public	<p>I have had an opportunity to review briefly the January 26 Joint Planning Commission Meeting Agenda Documentation at http://www.jacksonetonplan.com/files/2011/09/120126-Packet.pdf on the County's Comprehensive Plan web site. It is indicated that public comment will be invited at the workshop. However, with the forecast for another 1 1/2 feet of snow and the recent closures of Teton Pass due to Avalanche control, I anticipate it will be difficult to attend the meeting.</p> <p>I wish to comment on the changes to the draft wording of the Character District Maps / Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>To provide some background information relevant to my comments, the packet for the January 11-12 planning workshop describes the following transportation-related objectives under the heading "Implementation of the Approved Policies in the Character Districts:"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•7.2.c Maximize interconnection, redundancy and hierarchy in the transportation network•7.2.d Complete key Transportation Network Projects to improve connectivity•7.3.a Develop a land use pattern based on transportation connectivity <p>I see from the packet of information provided prior to the 1/26 workshop/meeting that it has been proposed to make a clarifying (coded color green) change to the draft plan wording:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Remove 7.2.c as an objective, and to Add 7.3.a as an objective. <p>In view of the considerable public comment which has been offered, it is unclear as to why this is being proposed, as existing transportation "connectivity" is a bit of a hodgepodge. Objective 7.2.c would appear to make it a goal to rationalize the roads and trails network, and therefore would be worth keeping in the Plan. It also would be worthy of consideration to add:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•7.2.d Complete key Transportation Network Projects to improve connectivity <p>to the Objectives for Alta, as that would relate directly to an objective of completing State Line Road, as originally planned and funded several years ago.</p>
1/25/2012	Koster, Ken Interested Public	<p>Just received an email from Alan Monroe with the information about tomorrow evening's meeting. Really short notice and I find myself at St. John's tomorrow morning for a 10:00 a.m. procedure. I am sure I will not feel like staying around for this meeting and will return home here in Alta.</p> <p>Briefly, my concern and real interest is that the State Line Road project be completed to 6000 North. You have been provided ample reasons for such completion and I will not repeat them.</p>

15: County Periphery

Date	Name	Comment
1/31/2012	Scott, Mary Gibson Grand Teton National P	<p>In June 2011, the Teton County Board of Commissioners and the Jackson Town Council formally adopted the Jackson - Teton County Comprehensive Plan. This action was the result of years of hard work by you, your staff, and many others, and we appreciated the opportunity to provide our own comments on issues relevant to Grand Teton National Park. We commend you on this important achievement and are pleased that the Plan includes numerous references to the importance of coordinating with local federal land managers.</p> <p>While the Comprehensive Plan identified common values, principles, policies, and strategies for achieving the communities' goals, the next step is to identify more specifically how development will be directed in particular areas. The Illustration of Our Vision phase that is currently underway therefore seeks to define the character of 15 individual districts within the Town of Jackson and Teton County. We have reviewed the draft Illustration of Our Vision document and found that it is consistent with and respectful of the resources and values of Grand Teton National Park. We are particularly appreciative of efforts to maintain wildlife movement corridors in areas where it is appropriate to do so.</p> <p>As you continue moving forward with the planning effort, and in other related efforts such as revising the Natural Resources Overlay and the land development regulations, we ask that you continue to be mindful of the potential effects of decisions on Grand Teton National Park. Development on the west side of the Snake River along the Wyoming 390 corridor (Teton Village, Aspens, and Wilson) is of particular importance because of the potential to adversely affect the Moose - Wilson Road corridor within the park. This corridor contains some of the most rich and sensitive wildlife habitat within Grand Teton National Park, and is highly valued for its primitive values, opportunities for wildlife viewing, and access to the Laurance S. Rockefeller Preserve. The rustic, narrow, and winding character of the Moose - Wilson Road, and the relatively slow travel speeds are key to enjoyment of this area. Traffic volumes, however, are rapidly approaching levels that will diminish the quality of visitors' experience, and are likely not sustainable. Future growth on the Wyoming 390 corridor, as well as transportationrelated actions may significantly impact the park and should be carefully considered by planners and decision makers.</p> <p>We also note that Character District 15, the County Periphery, includes agricultural lands and open space that are adjacent to or within the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park. We appreciate that the draft Illustration of Our Vision document states that the areas within the County periphery will remain rural in character, that open space will be preserved, and wildlife habitat and movement corridors will be protected and enhanced. These policies, along with the criteria describing development in the Buffalo Valley and Kelly areas are consistent with NPS goals for management of adjacent park lands. As the planning process continues to move forward, we would appreciate the opportunity to provide input on how the land development regulations and Natural Resource Overlay can be used as tools for protecting park resources and values where development on inholdings or adjacent lands is a concern.</p> <p>We appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments and look forward to continued coordination on planning and development decisions that have cross-boundary implications. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please feel free to contact me or Management Assistant Gary Pollock at (307) 739-3411 or 739-3428.</p>
1/25/2012	Bowditch, Fred Interested Public	<p>I wish to comment on the current Master Plan and suggested revisions, in particular to the Re-zoning of Rural Properties and Planned Unit Developments. I am very concerned that Teton County residents will not be able to subdivide or create a PUD on acreage that is less than 35 acres in the future. There are areas in this County where many residents have subdivided larger properties into 10 or 12 acre parcels, leaving a larger (35 or 40 acre parcel) literally "land-locked" by these smaller parcels. In the case of some of these parcels, the owners may have intentions to subdivide or create a PUD in the future, for investment purposes or future (retirement) income. To maintain continuity in a Homeowners Association, it would be odd and not in keeping with area character to have one single parcel of 40 acres surrounded by smaller 10 acre parcels. To eliminate the possibility of future PUD's would be to disregard a Homeowners Association's character, as well as the owner's future intentions.</p> <p>I respectfully request that you review your possible elimination of future PUD's on acreage of less than 35 acres. One extreme zoning regulation does not necessarily work for all of Teton County, and would be unfair to many land owners. I am asking in particular to review the zoning requirements of the Horse Creek Mesa plateau [see attached map], and leave the zoning as is, with the possibility of future PUD's. I appreciate your attention to this matter and look forward to your response.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/29/2012	Bloom, Rich	Alex – thanks for verifying the inadvertent slip on mapping the Melody pathways.
	Interested Public	On interconnectivity - staff may want to consider a global solution since the term - and the yellow circles - are used on a majority of the maps – although the unique language in area 10 and subarea 10.1 is more specific than any other character district – and strongly infers roadway interconnectivity. Most other districts talk about pedestrian interconnectivity.
		I would hope the electeds will adjust district 10 language emphasizing pathway interconnectivity.
		The term interconnectivity and the yellow symbol is perhaps confusing as in various areas it can mean, or infer, either pedestrian, pathway (includes equestrian and bike – not just pedestrian) – along with the most controversial for southern South Park - roadway. Assuming the commissioners agree to the change - especially since some felt it had already occurred – area 10 language could be adjusted to clarify pathway interconnectivity.
		Meanwhile staff may want to think whether elaboration of the legend on what the yellow symbol means would help interpreting its use in various districts.
		Currently the legend only has the following brief explanation:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Improved Interconnectivity: An area that will be characterized in the future by increased interconnectivity.
		There is an exponential jump when one moves from the goal of pedestrian - to pathway - to road interconnectivity.

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/27/2012	Harrice, Melanie Interested Public	<p>This plan, if adopted and followed, will create a homogenously overdeveloped Jackson Hole; one where the fate of each development will remain at the whim of the elected officials who approve or deny it.</p> <p>Who wants THAT??</p> <p>Maybe a corrupt developer or greedy landowner who stands to benefit from an upzone, but not your local residents who actually live and work here, and who make up most of this valley's community and most of its homeowners.</p> <p>In this version of the Comp Plan, I do not see any real protections, especially for rural and conservation areas, which are in need of the most protection. The Plan's content when you get right down to it is pure fluff with no teeth and no way to enforce any its the zoning districts, proposed rules, concepts and ideas.</p> <p>Put some teeth into this document and you'll finally see what real community support feels like.</p> <p>The Planning Commission should not have given in to pressure from above and recommended approval of a plan it wasn't completely comfortable with.</p> <p>This plan should not be forced through the political approval process until it is truly a document this community can contentedly live with.</p> <p>Currently, most people who live in JH believe this plan is severely flawed, vague and a generally useless document that has no enforcement provisions, too many development loopholes and no protections for the subdivisions they live in and have invested in.</p> <p>As you have heard countless times, people currently feel a sense of instability and have no idea what to expect for the districts they live and work in. They have no idea whether their home will soon be surrounded by more dense development, whether the quality of life they purchased when they bought their home in a subdivision will continue. Whether their zoning will change at the whim of elected officials at any given time.</p> <p>Zoning that exists should remain static; upzoning an already approved, existing subdivision or area is ethically wrong for the people who purchased homes there. And for the values determined by the original subdivision and covenants. Homeowners buy the type of home and quality of life they enjoy. Changing the rules on people who have invested everything they have in their home and property is purely WRONG.</p> <p>We're not talking NIMBYS or folks who have second homes here. So, please don't even bring that up. We're talking about YOUR AVERAGE WORKING RESIDENT OF TETON COUNTY!</p> <p>What is the point of a rule or a zoning district if it can be changed? Ask someone you know who is religious and you'll never hear that the doctrines, rules and commandments they live by are changeable.</p> <p>They are set in stone. Or in books that are considered sacred.</p> <p>The basic, fundamental laws that citizens follow in this country are not changeable - burglary, assault and battery, homicide, these crimes will continue to remain just that, crimes.</p> <p>Comparing zoning to the weighty issues mentioned above may seem trite. But please remember that people treat zoning as a RULE, a fixed rule, put in place by their government. It is not viewed as something that is changeable. Only those who have witnessed an unwanted upzone where they live get wise to this practice and become wary. Unfortunately, many in this valley are now wary of a toothless, weightless Comprehensive Plan that allows these kinds of fundamental development changes to a place we live in and cherish.</p> <p>It is appalling how much money has been spent on this Comp Plan process and how little political will exists to create a document that has teeth and enforcement capabilities. The money would be well spent if our community ended up with a document that guides our valley's future development</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/27/2012	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	<p>with enforceable rules.</p> <p>Instead, if this document is approved. Our valley will be in the same boat as always; each and every development decision will continue to lie solely with elected officials' interpretation of the Comprehensive Plan, whatever that may be at the time.</p> <p>There IS one consistent feeling among people who live in our passionate community: DISLIKE OF THIS CURRENT INCARNATION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN. And a thorough distrust of the political process this plan is moving through.</p> <p>It would be great if, for once, decision makers actually listened to these consistent shouts from the community.</p> <p>The Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance is deeply grateful for your efforts to ensure that the Comprehensive Plan prioritizes the protection of wildlife in Teton County. Preserving wildlife is central to the mission of the Alliance, and the new Character District Maps provide a unique opportunity to do a quick evaluation of the expected impacts that the planned development pattern might have on our wildlife.</p> <p>The Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance is pleased to announce that we have contracted with an expert team from Alder Environmental to conduct a wildlife impacts assessment based on the Character District Maps. Our objective is to provide you with an overview of how wildlife might fare under the new Comprehensive Plan. We intend to provide you with the findings of this study prior to your March 14th meeting, and we encourage you to address any recommendations made in the report. We believe that the Natural Resources Technical Advisory Board has the expertise to review this study on behalf of Teton County.</p> <p>The Alliance would like to provide you with science-based information on wildlife at each step of the planning process. Although this first study will be fairly general, we are willing to continue to refine this work when you are ready to review and adjust the current zoning maps.</p> <p>Please contact me with any questions or suggestions about this rapid assessment.</p>
2/23/2012	Round, Phil Interested Public	<p>It's hard to resist big money - especially in this country, and more specifically, in this county. But we are fast destroying what we love in this valley. I know you're faced with development pressures and the developers are the ones who populate your meetings. Please be steadfast in your convictions to preserve this valley. You've all paid lip service (at a minimum) to this philosophy, and some of you have certainly done more than that.</p> <p>The bottleneck that inevitably occurs with growth is certainly a mighty uncomfortable thing for planners to deal with. But it is a necessary part of HOLDING THE LINE. We've lost so much already. The eutrophication of Fish Creek is a reality, and just a few years ago it was held up as a shining example of small town, pristine waterway health. How many dead moose have I personally witnessed on the Village Rd. (dozens)? The Snake River levy has become the stomping ground of paid dog-walkers. They have displaced all but the aquatic and avian wildlife, but negatively affected those populations as well.</p> <p>Hold the line! I don't really care how it's done. It doesn't matter in the long run. Lots of damage has already been done. No more.</p>
2/21/2012	Murray, Don & Carol Interested Public	<p>After looking at areas like Park City, Vail, Lake Tahoe, etc., and having a home in Mammoth, Ca, my husband and I found Jackson Hole. It is the pristine, beautiful mountain area we were looking for. Not over-developed with so much density that ruins areas like this. Please keep the character of the valley special and do not support the increased development of the New Plan.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/10/2012	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	<p>The Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance greatly appreciates the efforts you have made to more effectively solicit public participation in the Comp Plan process during the last several months. The workshop format that you used for the Character District mapping was accessible to the general public, and generated excellent feedback that have informed your recommendations in each district.</p> <p>The Conservation Alliance believes that it is important to conclude the Comprehensive Planning process with robust public participation. Currently your schedule of activities seems to limit public input to either being submitted in writing, in personal meetings with decision makers or delivered from a podium in 3 minutes or less. This format effectively excludes many people who are informed and interested, but are not willing to engage in such a formal structure. Public input in this formal structure is inherently less of a dialogue in which people seek to reach mutual understanding, and more a statement of positions that may polarize the community. Continuing to only provide a formal format for the public at this stage in the process will make it very difficult get strong community support for the new Comp Plan.</p> <p>Therefore, we recommend that you redesign your meeting that is scheduled for March 14th. Please use an open workshop format, in which participants may come and go, and have the opportunity to sit at a table with elected officials to discuss their questions and concerns. We believe this opportunity for conversation will be greatly appreciated by the public, and it will provide you with final round of valuable input before you make your last recommendations. You may then convene the formal meeting later that evening, or a few days later.</p> <p>We recognize that this will require some readjustment of your schedules, either to add a few hours on the 14th, or to schedule a second day for your final recommendations. However, we strongly believe that it will be well worth your time.</p> <p>Thank you for considering this recommendation as you look for ways to maintain strong public participation and build support for the Comp Plan.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Newcomb, Mark Interested Public	<p>Well, I, too, definitely want to acknowledge Staff. They've done a huge amount of work. I want to really acknowledge the public. Those that have been engaged have been critical for me, very helpful, and I appreciate that. I certainly want to acknowledge our elected officials. They have no easy task yet ahead of them. And I also reflect all the other Commissioners' thoughts on the tremendous tension in this community between allowing people to exercise their property rights, at the same time, acknowledging the ecosystem that is so valuable to all of us and to the community. And in thinking about that, I jotted down some notes and the notes kept growing, so I'll read them here. But on any given day of the year any of us can experience the wild of our surrounding public lands, expect to see wildlife, inhale clean air, dangle a line into crystal-clear water, shop at a locally owned store, quaff a locally brewed beer from a locally owned brewery. We have it good. Furthermore, we have a strong and diverse community. From the dishwashers, to the teachers, to the real estate brokers, to the builders, to the financiers, to the third- and fourth-generation landowners, to the retired professionals, there is a place for everyone. This document enshrines balance between our environment and our community. I really believe it does to the extent possible. This document recognizes that ecosystem stewardship is preeminent, that therefore growth should be managed, and that those two efforts taken together will preserve our character. We all recognize that every additional square foot, every additional vehicle on the road, every additional human in Teton County, has an ecological cost. This document recognizes that cost but, more importantly, it recognizes that that cost, foot per foot, car per car, human per human can be reduced, that the ecological cost of someone moving here tomorrow can and should be lower than someone moving here today. On the other hand, this document recognizes the right to property owners. The exercise of those rights can incur ecological and social costs. The exercise of private property rights can compromise the ecosystem, generate growth, and impact community character. Past development did. Past development, under past Plans, placed 70 odd percent of the dwelling units in our County within wildlife habitat and scenic vistas, the very backbone of our ecosystem. Past development and past Plans placed the vast majority of development in the County. In the past, property owners were allowed to exercise their rights without mitigating the cost to the ecosystem and to our community character. This Plan envisions the ideal that new development and redevelopment will recognize and mitigate ecological costs and will strive to enhance community character. To be clear, under the vision of this Plan, development of any degree of intensity can only occur within limited portions of Town and, to a minor degree, in Wilson, the Aspens, and Teton Village. Located on a strong network of public transportation, supported by local services that will be enhanced over time, largely outside of crucial wildlife habitat, these are the areas where it just plain makes sense to have the development that houses our workforce and binds our community together. This Plan strives to conserve the maximum amount of open space possible in our rural County without diminishing the underlying property rights. This Plan does not down zone, though it does ask a lot of our community's large landowners. Under this Plan, they will be asked to address not just the economic cost of new development but the ecological and social cost as well. Opportunities to cluster exist in this Plan but only when the initiatives to open space are identifiable and substantial. And when all is said and done, this Plan, as structured, envisions an overall buildout less than what the '94 Plan allows for. Vital to this Plan is that it will be monitored and assessed. Managed growth means that every five years the fundamental tenets of this Plan to mitigate our ecological costs and preserve community character will be evaluated. Key metrics include the 60/40 ratio, development in complete neighborhoods, versus in rural areas, and a 65/35 ratio of in-County to commuting workforce. Many, as have I, recognize that the vision represented in this Plan is just that, a vision. Can it say more? Can it give us more certainty? Can it give us something more substantial to work with, some numbers, something to ponder, some costs and benefits? But let's consider where we are, what we have, what we are striving for. Our wildlife, our vistas, our elbowroom—these things we take for granted. They are communitywide benefits free and open to all. I can enjoy the open space as I drive south out of Town. You can enjoy the open space as you drive south out of Town. Anyone can enjoy the open space as you drive south out of Town. There's only one way we can be excluded from enjoying that view. A landowner can exercise their constitutional right to utilize their personal property. Yet, the Constitution also recognizes the right of the community to ask, even to require, that the landowner acknowledge and address some of the costs incurred to the community when exercising those rights. Alas, such costs are often diffuse, intangible, and without price. In other words, they are highly subjective. At what point does the size of one's house simply cost the ecosystem and our community too much? At what point does the intensity of a clustered development simply cost the ecosystem and our community too much? How many houses built next to mine are too many? One? Three? Five? Ten? How many houses built on the opposite side of the Valley from mine are too many? How long at a stop light is too long? How many dead ungulates on our roadways is too many? Should the span of sagebrush between my house and those houses yonder still be called open space if transformed into the ninth fairway of a golf course? Should a campground populated with small cabins on wheels still be called a campground? Wouldn't each and every one of us here tonight love a 10-page, double-spaced document that answered those questions in plain English? But I challenge any of us to find even as few as five other people in this room to sit down together and produce such a document. Let's be clear. It may cost money, plain and simple, for a landowner not to develop their property. Yet, when they do develop, it can inflict ecological and social costs on our community. While these costs may be diffuse and hard to quantify, they are costs. If we as a community want to address them, or avoid them, we can. We can monetize them and compensate landowners for the preservation of</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Stewart, Peter Interested Public	<p>open space and wildlife habitat. We can make them temporal and accept slower travel speeds, longer waits and the use of public transportation, even when it's inconvenient. We can personally internalize them by building smaller houses and living in tighter quarters with our neighbors and controlling our dogs and scooping their poop. In reality, all this and more probably has to happen, but none of it will without two things. The first is a vision, which I believe we now have. The second is action, action that must be taken communitywide. This Plan is as much yours as it is mine, or the Planning Staff's, or our elected officials. If this Plan says one thing is that we are all in this together. Let us act as a community.</p>
2/8/2012	Hammer, Mike Interested Public	<p>I also want to reiterate my gratitude to the Staff and to the public. I definitely didn't know what I was getting into. [Laughter] And I had been to a lot of public meetings before, and I appreciate what I've learned. And tonight's public comment really illustrates to me the polarity of opinions in this community and affect the impossibility of creating a Plan that has everything that everybody wants in it. It's just...it's impossible, I mean, that doesn't mean what we have is a poor product—I think it's an exceptional product—but I do think it's time to move it along to the next phase, to the electeds, and to a discussion of the details of how it's going to impact the LDRs and that type of thing. But I also I do think the character district maps, though imperfect, are a useful tool, because they address one of the public's main concerns, which is predictability, where it's going to be. You know, we're not putting numbers on it, but there's been really good conversations, you know, ever since we started discussing the character district maps. So, though imperfect, I think they're a nice tool. So, that's all I've got to say.</p>
2/8/2012	Lockhart, Kelly Interested Public	<p>I was not involved in this process. I came here when the electeds were finalizing the words, but I have worked on the '94 Plan and I worked on the 1978 Plan. Interestingly enough, I had a project in 1980 under the PUD Regulations, then the County Plan. They were three pages long and that was it. It's gotten a little more complicated. I read the character districts as implementing the words of the Plan, as proposed, and as driving future zoning and Land Development Regulations. I'm anxious to see LDRs that incent owners and developers to ?? remarkable things that encourage what ought to be done, rather than saying what can't be done. And I think this is going in the right direction.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Smith, Bill Interested Public	<p>Hi, I'm Bill Smith. I'll start with almost an apology that I've only dug into the planning documents strenuously in about the last two weeks. I've absorbed as much as I can. You, of course, are very conversant with them; I am not. I live in Character District 9 and as I read and reread the text there about Character District 9, I'll say that things were a bit ambiguous to me. There was little there that I could really say, YES, or NO, to, you know, it was...and also there was a table in there, and I saw other comments about this, that had, you know, solid bullets and half bullets and things like that in the table and, to be honest with you, I couldn't make sense of that. I didn't understand what that was trying to say to me. If it said, you know, there were bullets that said this is the way Character District 9 is right now and bullets that, you know, mark certain intersections and that kind of thing, and then a separate table that said this is the way we're planning it to be with also bullets and proper intersections and that kind of thing, that would have made some sense to me. But I couldn't discern whether the table that was there was showing me the way it is right now or the way that you would like to plan it to be. Unclear. And that was a general comment about the way this is drafted at this point. To the average reader like me, and I consider myself a decent litmus test, not really easy to read and interpret. The use of acronyms and things like that as well, I would encourage you to, you know, my question, what is a PRD and that kind of thing, go ahead and spell them out. If these are intended to be, again, reviewed by the public, then don't use a lot of acronyms and jargon that the average reader will not understand. Now, that said, the PDF that you sent out, the packet, or what was on the website there, I perused that pretty carefully and of course most of the content was a compendium of written documents or written comments that had come in, apparently at the January 26th meeting, is that true? And again my earlier question, apparently those comments have not been interpreted nor incorporated into anything that is available to me yet. So, for us making comments tonight, we're kind of behind the eight-ball to start with in the sense that we're not seeing the latest and greatest version of the documents. And again a comment for the future, if you do, you know, want public to comment and that kind of thing, take pains to give us the latest and greatest so we can see where it stands right now, not, uh, we'll get this stuff into it later, you know, that kind of thing. The...tonight of course there will be more public comments that are going to be gathered, including mine, and likewise those are not going to get into the documents tonight obviously and yet immediately following this meeting, apparently there's a vote of some kind to approve the documents as is. To me that feels strange that there's an approval of something before it's in a final form or a final draft form at least. It seems like there ought to be, you know, one feedback loop rather than a rush to vote tonight. I think we all agree that intelligent planning is a good idea as long as it's done fairly and competently and in keeping with constitutionally limited government. And as I read the documents, of course that was my first reaction about is the government sticking its horns too far into the rights of citizens to control and to use their property. The...neither the...well, the U.S. Constitution, the Fifth Amendment, protects property rights of people who own property. And things like requirements on the part of any government, local or whatever, that say you can't use a certain proportion of your property, or whatever, folks, it's a taking of the rights of that property owner. There's just no two ways about it. And if you say, Bill, you've got to reserve 80 percent of your property for an elk migration corridor, personally, I love elk. I've got elk all over my property, no problem whatsoever. On the other hand, why should I pay 100 percent tax, property tax, on that property when I can't even use 80 percent of it? So, it feels like, you know, if we're going to play that game of putting restrictions on property use, then somebody's got to pay the price of that and it shouldn't be the property owner. I'm giving up already. Oh, I'm sorry. Last couple of comments here. This planning process, I'm aware that it does proceed from general to more and more specific and more and more stringent, if you will, in terms of ultimately we're going to get building codes and ordinances and that kind of thing that are all going to come out of this. And, you know, there is some nervousness on my part about that. Already today we have a UN drafted, drafted by bureaucrats of the United Nations, an International Energy Conservation Code governing what we can do here in Teton County Wyoming, folks. And I'm saying if you observe what the UN does around the world, I'm saying, why is this in my backyard? Why is Bill Smith being governed by a document that was ultimately drafted, or initially drafted by the United Nations, or a bunch of bureaucrats in the United Nations? Aren't we smart enough to come up with building codes that are particular and right and correct for the place where we live? If that's where this is heading, I think you're going to get more and more headwind from me and a lot of other people like me that are saying, wait a second, what is the UN doing in my backyard specifying the building code? I think that's it. Thank you.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Allen, Barbara Interested Public	I am also one of the original members and I also chaired a year of these meetings, and while Michael and I often agree, and I do think that the Planning Commissions have done a great job, and we've listened to so much from expert testimony to public comment, etc. It's been great. It's been super informative. It's been wonderful. And I think we all benefit from the different perspectives that these Commissions have, and I think we've done a great job talking out those differences. Tonight I think we made great strides. Unfortunately, and I've struggled with this since this whole process started, I can't support these character districts, because I can't support the inherent philosophy behind them, and I don't see how a 40/60 goal can be accomplished in any other way than by padding the 60 and taking from the 40. And so, while I think there's been a lot of great discussion and I support a lot of the things that have been brought up, I inherently stick at that and I think it's inherently depending upon a philosophy of transferrable development rights, and so I can't support these character districts that I don't believe are based on something that works.
2/8/2012	Lewis, Richard Interested Public	My name is Richard Lewis; I'm a broker with Sotheby's International Realty and many of you guys already know me. And there are just two things that I want to address. You mentioned one of them up here with regard to a PRD and changing that acreage. Over the years, doing a lot of business in this Town, I've gotten to know and work with a lot of property owners and I've been involved in doing some of the PRDs, and I've also become very familiar what values are associated with being able to do one with regard to being able to have multiple home sites and the hoops that you have to jump through in order to accomplish these clustered sites on a PRD. And when I start seeing things like 160 acres, even in consideration, right off the bat, I can tell you there's not that many 160-acre parcels that are even available or exist here, so it almost eliminates any kind of development or PRD situation of any sort. And then if I was an owner of a 40-, 35-, 40-, 50-, 60-acre parcel, acre of land in Teton County, and I see this being considered, I can see that, say, for instance, the number you guys decide is 75 or 80 acres, whatever it is, it's equivalent to coming in and putting a...the County putting a conservation easement on the property and devaluing it right off the bat, I mean, as much as half, if not more, depending on where it is. And if that was something that was seriously being ready to be voted on, I'd be interested to see all those owners in Teton County what they would really think of their property being devalued right out of the gate, you know, with an action such as that. And the second thing I wanted to speak to is the Housing Authority. I really don't quite get...I started looking at the money that is...the tax money that's being given to the Housing Authority just to manage the Housing Authority, not even including the cost of some of the construction and things that the Housing Authority is spending our tax money on. And then I start looking at, as a realtor, I don't just sell the high-end stuff here, I sell stuff in Teton Valley. Looking for a place for my kids right now over there. I know what's going on in Alpine. You know, we're missing the boat I think on this. Those communities should be extensions of us. And, you know, depending on where you are in this community, you're anywhere from 35 minutes to maybe 45 minutes on average from downtown Jackson. I mean, most people who live in cities, just that's their average commute anyway. I don't understand why we don't sit down and look at the numbers and what is being spent. I mean, you could upgrade the transit system to each one to make it easier and transport more people and spend far less money than we're spending as taxpayers and burdening current property owners. And especially with the market the way it is right now and as cheaply as you can go over the hill and buy a three-bedroom, two-bath, two-car garage setting on 0.4 of an acre for \$110,000/\$120,000 right now, and these people would actually own their property without any restrictions. It just seems like a mismanagement of funds and not taking advantage of these communities. And by taking this step, you're also encouraging the market in those communities, and when the markets come up, you're going to have more people investing in infrastructure in those communities, which will ultimately make it more attractive to the people who are working and commuting here. Okay, so that's all I have to say. Thank you.

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Nash, Paul Interested Public	I, too, want to kind of mirror what Michael had said. I do believe that a Plan that shows a lot of compromise is a Plan that shows how diverse we are as community, so I would like basically not get into where I think we could have done better or could have done...we definitely could have done worse, but kind of stick to that. What I do want to focus on are going through three sets of thank you's. First and foremost would be to these committees. I think actually getting involved is the best way to adjust the system, and try and get what you want out of a system is actually to get involved. And seeing what, you know, not necessarily myself, but what everybody else has done and given up, as far as their evenings, I applaud that and I think it's certainly noteworthy. The second would be to Staff, both Town and County. I think they took most of the heat on a lot of the issues and they bared all of the burden of putting together verbiage and keeping us informed, keeping us on track, and ultimately, in my opinion, providing us with a good document. One suggestion I would have moving forward is that they take this experience and take the time to put together what they think in the future would be a better way to move forward, so it doesn't take a long time, so we don't burn out the public, like it's been obvious, and just so the people that are sitting in our positions right now have a better way. Or maybe this speaks to predictability, a more predictable way of how we're going to move forward on this Plan in ten or so years in the future. And then the third would be mostly to the public, you know, the dedicated few that are here every night and then also the 500+ others that provided us comments and talked to us on the streets and wrote, you know, wrote in what they were thinking and work, jobs, things like that. So, I think that is ultimately what creates this community, this County, and turns it into something more than just a bunch of people living in an area, that we actually are a community. So, I'll turn it over to Mark.

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Biolchini, Robert Interested Public	<p>Good evening everybody, my name is Robert Biolchini. I've got a couple, well, concerns over this Comprehensive Plan and where it's going and I'm here to make some comments, but more importantly I'd like to ask some questions of all of you. And in the past I asked to have not only you but our County Commissioners and the elected body to assimilate and give back an idea of costs, and I'm not necessarily talking about dollar costs. I'm talking about costs to I guess we the people. This Plan...or in seeking that response I never really got anything that gave me an idea that people were really looking at what this was going to cost us in terms of a community. Most of the people that I've talked to with regard to this planning process really aren't for it. They weren't for the '94 Plan; they're not necessarily for this Plan. And so I started to go and investigate a little bit more. And in that journey I found out that, as we all know, 97% percent of Teton County will never be developed. And as I start to listen to the language of how this thing is being sliced and diced along the way, all I'm hearing is nodes and open space and let's take from the people and put it into the collective within the confines of how a committee is trying to determine individual property rights without just compensation. Where I'm going with all of this is, if this Plan was left to a free-market society, all good ideas would surface and all bad ideas would go away. However, what we're finding is that, if this planning process was a good one, it would have been adopted quite awhile back. However, where I'm starting to see problems and directives on why these processes, meaning the planning processes, get clogged up so much is something that I think some individuals already commented on tonight, which is UN Agenda 21, how it's infiltrated all levels of planning nationwide, and I would encourage all of you to educate yourself on exactly what UN Agenda 21 really is. It is, in essence, a goal that is put forth by the UN to strip the United States people of their sovereignty slowly over time by way of the planning process. We even have an example here recently that I'd like to bring everybody's attention to where the people of Teton County are now required to adhere to international codes derived by the UN 21 Agenda and then taxed by these codes, when these codes were never voted on by we the people. And what I'm speaking to specifically, and this is the one example that I found, is the 2006 International Energy Conservation Code amended and adopted the 21st of July 2009 here in Teton County, and this is in fact taxation without representation. Where do these taxes go? What do they go into? Can we have an audit to see where they went, if you are in fact going to take those from us? In my opinion, each piece of property, private property that is, has its own unique merits and it's the right of the owner of that property to develop within reason—and what I mean by within reason is obviously not to have a pig farm or something like that within city limits—but within reason. And those merits should be drawn upon the free-market society, not by a committee trying to tell you how big your house is or what color it should be or how tall it should be. So, as we start to go through this process, this planning process, that you all are embarking upon and kind of forcing upon us, if you will, what we're dealing with is the situation that becomes discriminatory. Okay, thank you. It's discriminatory in that when you all pull out a map and you start to draw lines on a map, you have winners and you have losers, and those winners and losers are...well, you can draw it out in dollar terms if you want...but when it's subjective, when it's private property and you're trying to dictate what people are to do with their private property, I would refer you back to what is referred to in the Constitution as just compensation. And if you all are stepping in to say, well, this development over here gets commercial and this one's open space, with no regard for the individuals involved, where is the just compensation? And where do you derive that compensation? Does that come from another governing body? Excuse me, does that come from a tax derived from a governing body that we're supposed to pay along the way? Sure. I'd like to just say that this is a free-market system that we're in and when I start to look at a lot of the things that we have in front of us, I'm asking this group to adhere to and pay attention to anything that has to do with Agenda 21 and the UN and take it out of this Plan a hundred percent. And with that I thank you for your time.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Newcomb, Mark Interested Public	<p>On any given day of the year, I can experience the wild of our surrounding public lands, expect to see wildlife, inhale clean air, dangle a line into crystal clear water, and finish the day having a locally brewed beer at a locally owned brew pub. This thanks to our unique and sound environment. Furthermore, on any given day I might run into friends that include dishwashers, teachers, real estate brokers, builders, guides, financiers and third and fourth generation land-owners. This thanks to a community that has a place for everyone. This document enshrines balance between our environment and our community.</p> <p>This document recognizes that ecosystem stewardship is preeminent, that therefore growth should be managed, and that those two efforts taken together will preserve our character. We all recognize that every additional square foot, every additional vehicle on the road, every additional human in Teton County, has an ecological cost. This document recognizes that cost, but more importantly, it recognizes that that cost, foot per foot, car per car, human per human, can be reduced, that the ecological cost of someone moving here tomorrow can and should be lower than someone moving here today.</p> <p>On the other hand, this document recognizes the rights of property owners. The exercise of those rights can incur an ecological and social cost. The exercise of private property rights can compromise the ecosystem, generate growth and impact community character.</p> <p>Past development did. Past development under past plans placed 70 odd percent of the dwelling units in our county within wildlife habitat and scenic vistas—the very backbone of our ecosystem. Past development and past plans placed the vast majority of development in the rural county, not in town. In the past, property owners were allowed to exercise their rights often without mitigating the costs to the ecosystem and to our community character.</p> <p>This plan envisions the ideal that new development and redevelopment will recognize and mitigate ecological costs and will strive to enhance community character. To be clear, under the vision of this plan, development of any degree of intensity can only occur within limited portions of town and to a minor degree in Wilson, the Aspens and Teton Village. Located on a strong network of public transportation, supported by local services that will be enhanced over time, largely outside of crucial wildlife habitat, these are the areas where it just plain makes sense to have the development that houses our workforce and binds our community together.</p> <p>This plan strives to conserve the maximum amount of open space possible in our rural county, without diminishing the underlying property rights. This plan does not downzone, though it asks a lot of our community's large landowners. Under this plan, they will be asked to address not just the economic cost of new development, but the ecological and social costs as well. Opportunities to cluster exist in this plan, but only when the additions to open space are identifiable and substantial. And when all is said and done, this plan as structured, envisions an overall build-out less than or equal to what the '94 plan allows for.</p> <p>Vital to this plan is that it will be monitored and assessed every five years. Managed growth means that every five years the fundamental tenants of this plan—to mitigate our ecological costs and preserve community character—will be evaluated. Key metrics include the 60/40 ratio of development in complete neighborhoods vs. in rural areas and the 65/35 ratio of in-county to commuting workforce.</p> <p>Many, as have I, recognize that the vision represented in this plan is just that, a vision. Can't it say more, give us more certainty, something more substantial to work with? Some numbers to ponder? Some costs and benefits?</p> <p>But let's consider where we are, what we have, what we are striving for. Our wildlife, our vistas, our elbow room—these things we take for granted—are community-wide benefits, free and open to all. I can enjoy the open space driving south out of town; you can enjoy the open space driving south out of town; anyone can enjoy the open space driving south out of town. There is only one way we can be excluded from enjoying that view. Land-owners can exercise their constitutional right to utilize their personal property. Yet the constitution also recognizes the right of the community to ask, even to require, that the land-owner acknowledge and address the costs incurred to the community when exercising those rights. Alas such costs are often diffuse, intangible and without price; in other words, highly subjective.</p> <p>At what point does the size of one's house simply cost the ecosystem and our community too much? At what point does the intensity of a clustered development simply cost the ecosystem and our community too much? How many houses built next to mine are too many? One, three, five, ten? How many houses built on the opposite side of the valley from mine are too many? How long at a stoplight is too long? How many dead ungulates on our roadways is too many? Should the span of sage-brush between my house and those houses yonder still be called open space if transformed into the ninth fairway of a golf course? Should a campground populated with small cabins on wheels still be called a campground?</p> <p>Wouldn't each and every one of us here tonight love a ten-page, double-spaced document that answered those questions in plain English? But I challenge any of you to find even as few as five other people in this room to sit down together and produce such a document.</p> <p>Let's be clear. It may cost money, plain and simple, for a landowner not to develop their property. Yet when they do develop, it can inflict ecological and social costs on our community. While these costs may be diffuse, intangible and hard to quantify, they are costs. If we as a community want to</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	<p>address them, or avoid them, we can. We can monetize them, and compensate landowners for the preservation of open space and wildlife habitat. We can make them temporal and accept slower travel speeds, longer waits and the use of public transportation, even when it's a little inconvenient. We can personally internalize them by building smaller houses and living in tighter quarters with our neighbors (and controlling our dogs and scooping their poop....). In reality, all of this, and more, has to happen. But none of it will happen without two things. The first is a vision, which I believe we now have. The second is action, action that must be taken community-wide.</p> <p>This plan is as much yours as it is mine, or the planning staff's, or our elected officials. If this plan says one thing, it is that we are all in this together. Let us act as a community.</p>
2/8/2012	Pierson, Scott Interested Public	<p>Good evening, I'm Trevor Stevenson, speaking for the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. You all have a number of very specific things you're going to be working through this evening and I know you've just gained a number of other specific things that the public has brought up. I want to put you back at a couple of the really big issues that I think it's really important that you all, as a Joint Commission, weigh in on, recognizing that ultimately these will be decided by the elected officials but nonetheless that your input is very valuable on this. The first one is to make more clear in the Plan, and in particular in the character districts, that the intention is to shift development around, not to simply increase it in some of the areas, where we're seeing that clearly illustrated in the maps, but the intention is to balance that. There will be increases and there will be decreases associated with that. Sort of a statement of intent, clearly put within the character district maps, would again alleviate a lot of concern within the public that they're not seeing clearly illustrated there the intent to balance increases and decreases in density throughout the County, which I think is an idea that everybody supports. And you'd gain a lot more support for the Plan if that were stated more clearly in there. The second piece that I think is important for you to weigh in on, and I'm not sure really got addressed in your last meeting, was that the Alliance has made a recommendation that you consider more clearly stating the intent around the amount of development in each of the character districts. What we're talking about here is not buildout numbers, and I know you talked some about buildout numbers last time. But essentially the character districts describe the intent of the future of each area in the County and they describe it in textual terms. It sort of says, you know, the type of development that will be there. We think it would benefit the community greatly and benefit the Plan greatly if you could also give some direction, essentially a recommendation, to the electeds that it would be useful to also include the amount. You hear this consistently from the public and we heard a lot last time about the confusion about the amount of development that was being called for in the Aspens and that caused an uproar. Now there's confusion about the amount of development that is potentially called for in Northern South Park, Area 5.6. And we can kind of run into this over and over, but I think it would be useful to kind of explicitly name an intended amount, not a restriction, just an intent. So I would ask that you speak to that a little bit. And those are just a couple of the big issues that I think are really important for all of you, as a Joint Planning Commission, to weigh in on, and thank you for your insight on all this.</p>
2/8/2012	Wemple, Robert Interested Public	<p>Good evening, I'm Scott Pierson. I live and work here in the Valley. I was just listening to Trevor about putting numbers on every area, and if you put numbers on it, you might as well put a bull's eye on it. Just as with the Aspens, you'll see each neighborhood rise up and target those areas. I can see the ad in the newspaper, Jackson Hole target over here, 2400 units, target over there, 2400 units. So I'd encourage you not to do that unless you want all this work that you've worked on five years just to fall apart, because it will be a reason to protest in each part. It's just going to happen that way when it happens. It happened already at the Aspens and you pulled back from the Aspens. The reality is the numbers at the Aspens that were projected to be there, it takes two things, at least. One is a willing developer and the other is somebody with the land that's willing to let it happen. And then you have to have the economy to make sure that that happens as well. None of those three things is here now and I don't see all three of those things coming in the short-term future. So, when you're looking 20 years out with those numbers, it's all going to fungible move around a little bit, so saying 400 here, 800 there, is I think the wrong direction to go. Thank you.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	<p>Gregory Griffith, West Bank. I couldn't disagree more with Mr. Pierson. This is a very intelligent demographic of public. We understand the numbers at least as well as some of the decision-makers and we should be trusted with that. I've heard elected officials recently say this isn't a numbers-based plan, it's a character-based plan. That's utter hogwash. That's a derivative of the facilitator. Every facet of planning is a derivative of a number. Even if you're looking at wildlife, you're looking at percent above or below an objective, if you're looking at vehicle miles traveled, if you're looking at capital improvement plans, population projections—everything is based on a number and we should be trusted with those. The problem with the outcry of the community is the community said from day one they didn't want additive growth because the need wasn't there, not because we're all evil misanthropic mimics. You made a mistake last week by leaving 12.1 at the Aspens as a naked node, a commercial core that will simply create inflow radial traffic. It doesn't stand alone; it's ?? should actually retake, quite frankly. There's a lot of questions brought up by individuals in the community here, Kelly and...I agree with almost everything Mr. Lockhart said, amazingly. Bill also brought up some interesting...and I'm glad some electeds are here tonight, because this illustrates how inefficient this process has been. We're still asking and attempting to answer the same questions that we did five years ago. We don't know the difference, and we haven't had the studies, and we haven't had the substantive discourse to determine what is a taking, what is a performance-based incentive, and performance-based property right. But yet we're talking about all this shifting around and we're missing the boat on the base premise of this entire Plan, sought from the beginning, and that was permanent protection for our wildlife. In working with landowners who are the stewards of that, I suggested four years ago, and continually suggested, that we have a PRD/transfer mechanism task force so that we could have simultaneously, concurrently, gathered this information, but in the infinite wisdom the electeds saw not to do that out of sheer conflict ??, not because it made sense. Someone could walk up to this podium with a grand unified theory of Teton Village planning and it would be rejected because of political considerations, etc., etc. Anthony, I think I caught the gentleman's name, brought up one of the big fears moving forward with this Plan and that's instrumentalism, that we won't hold to what we say we're going to do. We've seen it happen so often in the past that items that we write in will be selectively interpreted, etc., etc. So, there's a lot of good comments. One specific request, besides the 12.1, is glossary. Commissioner Mr. Duncker brought this up day one at your...we don't want to see permeability defined as a five-foot-wide space for a four-foot-wide moose to get through it. We want an actual community-accepted definition. Walkability would be another example. And acronyms that someone from the community mentioned also would be...You know, I brought it up last week about Staff's numbers. The overage from 6800 base property right, how do we arrive at that 11,100 number? There's about a 45 percent overage in phantom density there, and the only way to refute that is to release the numbers. There are state school sections we know are going to the Park Service. We have NC-SF, RA6, RA3 lot split that don't have a conducive historic utilization rate to equal these numbers, so it would be nice for you to direct Staff to parse those numbers out so that we can not transfer at the highest level of the scale. There's one more problem...I could go on all night...but there's one more main problem and that is the assumption that we're going to go from 40/60 to 60/40 without going through 50 percent. We're at 55/45 now. By adopting that 60/40 aspirational goal, it pins us down to operating at the high end of the number scale. Staff's draft pointed that out, their continuum of choices. The electeds ought to conform to existing policies of going to have to make those high-number choices because of an over ascribing to an aspirational goal of 60/40. Fifty percent would be well within the realm of this Plan. I honestly don't think by pulling the numbers apart that we can get there, so that's another substantive change. Thanks.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/8/2012	Pruett, Michael Interested Public	<p>Yeah, I'll start. I am one of those people who have been in on the process since the very beginning, since the first meeting at St. John's, etc. I chaired those meetings for awhile, so it has been a long process, and I think it has been sometimes painful but a very positive process. I know the public has gotten tired of a lot of this stuff and they've made a lot of comment about that, but overall I think that having two boards combined like this, although it's been very difficult, I think ultimately we brought up some very, very difficult issues that we've had to work through with the public. And I think these Planning Commissioners, all of the people who have been involved now and in the past, really have done a good job of working through those. I would say that not...a sign to me of a good Plan is when you don't get everything that you want, and I can personally say I've not gotten everything I want out of this Plan, but I can say that I've gotten a lot of what I would like to see for this Valley. And my feeling about that is that I think the two planning boards have listened very carefully to the public opinion. We've...boy, have we listened to a lot of public opinion and public comment. And I think overall we've done a very good job of taking the Plan that was given us from day one and really, really scaling it back. I know that might not feel that way to a lot of people, but I think that is the overall end result of where we are today, because what we had before is very different from what we have right now. So, overall, I can say I'm overall very happy with moving forward. I think there are...I think this Plan does fix a lot of transparency and clarity problems that were in the '94 Plan. I think it is a step forward. I think the challenges that we've faced with the public is bringing these issues to light that weren't identified in the '94 Plan. So, by bringing those to light, it causes controversy and question and I think we've done a good job overall, the public, Planning Department and our boards, of really addressing very, very difficult issues. I don't think we've fixed everything. I don't think this is a silver bullet by any means. I don't think this will carry us for 20 years, but I think it is a very good step forward. A couple more final comments—I know I'm a little long-winded, I'm sorry, but this has been a long process...[Laughter] I do...I think that there's two things that I would say I'm a little bit...I have a little bit of angst about. My first one is that we didn't put a little bit more emphasis on property rights overall in the Plan, both in the County and the Town. I think we took a very long hard look at housing, wildlife and things like that, and I think we probably could have gone a little bit stronger on property rights. And my hope in this Plan, and with the electeds specifically, is that, when they look at this, they really take a hard look at those and make sure that those are protected for the public. My other feeling of angst I would say is I think we need...and my advice or solution...my advice to the electeds and looking forward is I think we need to take a really, really strong look communitywide at our housing program. There's been a lot of public opinion about housing when that came up. We spent a lot of time on that chapter. I know it was a new chapter as of the '94 Plan and we have come a long way since '94, but I think we've gone off our path and I think we need to really take about three steps back on our housing program and the way it's set up today, and look at how we can come up with some very strong market-rate...or market solutions, free-market solutions. I know there's members of this public that are here who are on a housing committee that I think came up with some super suggestions on how we can take our program today and make it better, and I think we really...and I would strongly encourage our electeds to take a really hard look at that and make some very, very big changes to our housing program. I think we can accomplish the goals that we want but still have a free-market solution and still get what we want from the public. Overall, I think that's really pretty much my comments. Overall, I am pleased with where we've come. It has been difficult and frustrating, but overall I'm pleased with what the public has done and their input. And I know the faces that are in here who have been here as much as we have as well. Thanks to the Planning Department and thanks to all the board members who are here and the prior members who served from day one.</p>
2/8/2012	Stennis, John Interested Public	<p>Well, I would reiterate Dana's thanks to all the public who's turned out to comment on the Comp Plan, the Staff for their immense amount of time that they spent developing this, and then to all the fellow Commissioners for all the volunteer time that they've put in. It has been a long process, but I feel like the product that we're getting from this is really moving us a huge step forward and it is improving a lot of things that we really didn't like about the '94 Plan. And things that we see in the Valley now, that I think there's a sense that we don't...you know what you have, so you don't...you're worried about what the change will be, and I think we're doing a lot of good things in this Comp Plan that we probably shouldn't be so fearful of. You know, unfortunately, I think, to reiterate Michael's point, that no one Plan can encompass all the ideas presented by the community, but I think we've done as good of a job as we possibly can. And I'll just submit the rest of my comments in writing.</p>
2/7/2012	Kayem, Curtis and Kelly Interested Public	<p>Please visit Sinclair, Wyoming. It is an ugly mess from overcrowding! Is that what we want Jackson Hole to look like? Visitors will not want to invest in a remote place that loses its soul! Please think responsibly, Curtis and Kelly Kayem, homeowners in Wilson and Jackson. Thank you</p>
2/5/2012	Rockwell, Donald and L Interested Public	<p>We share the concerns of neighborhood groups about your redo of the Comprehensive Plan for Jackson Hole. We implore you to KEEP JACKSON HOLE AND ITS NEIGHBORHOODS STABLE and to curtail the development of the Valley into a more urban community.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/4/2012	Brooks, Susan Interested Public	<p>Everything I read suggests that the city and county are in the pockets of the real estate and building businesses. A shame.</p> <p>I moved here from an upscale NJ suburb with NO open land. The real estate and building businesses did just fine because real estate was in demand and sold quickly and there was a big business in remodels, additions and tear downs. They did not try to tear down big houses and build condos. They respected the character and quality of the town. I suggest that you all do the same for this county and stop trying to make it into a city.</p>
2/3/2012	Bocker, Carol and Dee Interested Public	<p>Please take into serious consideration to resist a transition to this Valley and make it more urban. We have chose to live here because of its uniqueness; it truly is a special place. We came and stayed because of its open space and small town characteristics. We appreciate our wildlife and that they have room to live a natural life. Neighborhoods should not grow - if anything they should downsize. And as far as the tourists and the benefits from them, they too come because we have remained special and held our size.</p> <p>Please dump this re-doing of the Comprehensive Plan - it is fine the way it is and our Valley needs protection.</p>
2/3/2012	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	<p>Thank you for your public service and hard work. Current events around the world, and especially in the Middle East today, are a reminder of how fortunate we are to live in a place where public participation is an expected part of the political process.</p> <p>Below are comments on the Comprehensive Plan Draft. A letter similar to the below was submitted to the New and Guide's editor for this week's paper.</p> <p>When the Aspens was delisted as a density target, Planning Commissioner Paul Duncker's response was "we need some other spots", referring to neighborhoods to which planners could ADD density. It appears the Comprehensive Plan process has become a game of whack-a-mole. Why? The community does not want additive growth nor do we have the funds to pay for the associated roads, sewers, law enforcement and other infrastructure costs, not to mention the costs that are off the books such as the degradation of our environment and loss of small town, rural character. There is already room for a doubling of both commercial and residential development in the pipeline, not to mention a backlog of unused commercial space and a glut in the residential housing market. Who could possibly benefit from adding additional entitlements?</p> <p>The concept of preserving wildlife habitat and open spaces by shifting actual density into already developed areas is constructive and I believe one the community supports. The key is to shift actual density potential, not simply add new density. Adding density accomplishes nothing but sprawl. Right now Middle and Southern South Park are on the maps as rural areas with important scenic and wildlife value to preserve by moving development rights from these areas into a corner of Northwest South Park. If this is done right (i.e. without bringing in growth from elsewhere in The County), permanent conservation can be achieved by clustering units into a residential neighborhood, consistent with Cottonwood Park, the adjacent neighborhood and, most importantly, without adding density. It is important to keep in mind that conservation is the driving force behind clustering neighborhoods, not adding density. No one wants added density of any sort and that includes phantom density. Please instruct the planners to throw out the density you intended for the Aspens. It has no community benefit.</p>
2/3/2012	Jennings, Marc Interested Public	<p>Have you not learnt the message about greed and stupidity yet ...Nature is the only thing left to create any sense of well being , to think and to put some perspective to our existence....More houses means more people which dilutes any chances for nature ...Visiting Nature is one thing and yes should be accessible for all to behold ,but to build is just plain dumb ..I now we will be told Jobs Jobs Jobs well create them out of preserving and visiting this place and not enriching a few to build yet more hideous and polluting dwellings forever spoiling the views and beauty for everybody.....</p>
2/3/2012	Zardus, Heidi Interested Public	<p>Please don't ruin Jackson Hole! Please protect wildlife and open space in the new comprehensive Plan. I don't want more urbanization of Jackson Hole. There is only one Jackson Hole. It's special. It needs to be protected. It can't accommodate huge urban development, and there is not reason it should. There are many other places that are not national treasures, where development is appropriate. Not here. Please protect the qualities of this valley that most people come here for.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/3/2012	O'Brien, Paul F. Interested Public	<p>As we near the end of the long Plan process I want to re-emphasize a point I have made over the past few years, and raise a new concern.</p> <p>First, the primary goal of this Plan should be to play defense, to control, limit, regulate, and indeed discourage development. This is not because development is bad. It is not. It is because intense pressures to develop Teton County are inevitable. Current development rights are large; the County is uniquely attractive for lifestyles, recreation, and scenery; and growing global growth will fuel demand. Combine that thought with the expressed will of the residents and you have a clear objective.</p> <p>Second, I have been disappointed to see signs that the Plan process may be trying to drive wedges among neighborhoods and communities by looking for "someplace" to put density. The character district approach has value in allowing the Plan to consider local issues and concerns. But it must not be used as a tool to divide. So far, community groups have recognized this risk and reinforced their solidarity. But I would welcome clear and emphatic statements from planners and elected officials that they understand this danger and will oppose any efforts to set district against district.</p> <p>Finally, I want to thank all of you for the work you have done. It has been a long process, but much has been and can be accomplished from it.</p>
2/2/2012	Campbell, Leon G. Interested Public	<p>For four long years, elected officials and the Jackson Community have been working on the draft Comprehensive Plan which, when completed, will establish the future character of the Jackson Hole Valley for generations. It has been a long and exhaustive process which remains unfinished yet is being scheduled for completion early this year.</p> <p>It is ironic, despite the long hours devoted to such an important document, that the draft today is hardly comprehensive in the sense that maximum densities are still not established and thus, residential areas including Jackson, the Aspens, South Park and Teton Village fear that additional density from the more remote reaches of the County will be visited upon them in the new Plan, robbing them of their cohesion and unique character. These neighborhoods are in competition with each other to remain relatively rural and open.</p> <p>The Plan must mandate that infill development first be approved in Jackson, but only to a point where the town is able to preserve its Western frontier character as the "Last Best Place" in a rapidly urbanizing nation. However, if growth limits are established for Jackson, it is also necessary to limit the growth in the above neighborhoods at the amount entitled in 1994 which presently allows doubling of the built environment! For elected officials to permit additive growth in these several residential areas in the new Plan is madness. Additional densities can be left to future generations if the situation so dictates well into the future.</p> <p>In the South Park neighborhood, as an example, good planning would dictate that High School Road, which bisects the Northwest corridor of this neighborhood, remain rural to encourage walking and bicycling and minimizing automobile traffic. If development of the northwest quadrant of South Park results in residential growth in view of 1,000 homes it would exceed the size of Cottonwood Park, Rafter J and Melody Ranch neighborhoods combined!</p> <p>Moreover, any density approvals in northwest South Park must be linked to and contingent upon large landowners and the Jackson Hole Land Trust securing permanent conservation easements on the southerly part of South Park which not only functions as a scenic gateway to Jackson but an important wildlife corridor as well.</p> <p>A truly Comprehensive Plan, which has the primary objective of keeping rural, more distant and detached parts of the County, hardly is intended to accept growth from other parts of the Valley such as Alta and Buffalo Valley, at Jackson's expense nor to encourage additional commercial, industrial or mixed-use projects which additive density would demand.</p> <p>Density maximums must be established in the Plan so that growth is sequentially established in Jackson and its several residential communities consistent with their historical character. This is the key component of the Plan that the public has demanded of elected officials for four years and which is still not clarified in the latest draft. The community has spoken plainly that it does not wish additive growth. Nor does it have the funds or inclination to pay infrastructural costs of such growth. If elected officials recognize this fact and institutionalize it with growth limits and density maximums it will become abundantly clear that Jackson has 'men who match our mountains' who have served this community faithfully and well.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/2/2012	Harvey, Ann Interested Public	<p>I am writing once again to comment on the seemingly endless comprehensive plan process. The bottom line, I think, is that you need to ensure that the plan lives up to its lofty ideals of protecting wildlife, habitat, scenery, and the other values that define Jackson Hole. You do not do this by adding more growth, whether it's in Wilson, the Aspens, South Park, or anywhere else in the valley. The more growth the plan allows, the more fragmented and degraded wildlife habitat becomes, and the more Jackson Hole resembles all the other places where humans dominate the landscape. Please stop thinking in terms of nodes, or spots, or whatever other cancerous terms describe additive growth in Jackson Hole. We do not want or need a plan that calls for more growth. It's hard to imagine what Jackson Hole will be like with the doubling in growth that's already allowed--how can you possibly think that it's your duty to encourage even more?</p> <p>When will specific mechanisms for decreasing development in rural areas, and permanently preserving open space, be revealed to the public? Learning from the newspaper that there's a lot of "flexibility" in how 2000 potential units will be shifted from rural areas to denser areas does little to inspire confidence that this is anything more than fantasy. It's a laudable ideal to concentrate growth in the town of Jackson and decrease it in the rural parts of the valley, but until the second part of the equation is dealt with, you shouldn't be even considering additive growth anywhere in the County. After 4 years of planning, shouldn't the means of decreasing density be figured out? It's easy to allow more growth and hard to preserve open space, but taking the path of least resistance is not exactly good planning.</p> <p>I'm glad to see that the current version of the plan calls for preserving much of South Park instead of making the whole thing a density dumping ground. Please stick to this. And if any increase in density is approved for the Northwest corner, it must be clearly tied to decreasing density and permanent open space protection throughout the rural areas of South Park. The map descriptions should affirm this and be consistent with the plan language. No density increase should be directed to South Park until the Town has reached its infill potential. And no commercial development should be allowed in South Park.</p> <p>I am also entirely supportive of the Village Road residents who object to adding growth to the Aspens area. It just doesn't make sense to do that, given transportation and infrastructure issues, as well as wildlife values in that part of the valley.</p>
2/2/2012	Boynton, Bryan Interested Public	<p>Please keep Jackson Stable.</p> <p>My wife and I live here for the small town character, wildlife/open space and community.</p> <p>Lets not change it since a few greedy developers want to get richer.</p>
2/2/2012	Muromcew, Alexander Interested Public	I wish to support the message in the ad in today's JH Daily by the Village Road Coalition and the Wilson Advisory Committee: Please keep our neighborhoods stable. I am against the urbanization of Jackson Hole.
2/2/2012	Close, Tina Interested Public	<p>I have lived here 30 years and seen the wildlife go down in population.</p> <p>Please, please; please NO MORE Density anywhere! We have enough human population in the valley. Add more and takes away our good life here.</p> <p>Have some guts to say NO to more development and more density.</p>
2/2/2012	Hocking, Scott Interested Public	Please stop adding density to Teton County. We need a stable community of a small size to not further impact or destroy the wildlife that lives in Teton County. High density housing belongs next to cities, not in this remote corner of our state. Please include buildout population numbers in your forecasts. These allow for rational discussion about future population, and allows residents to envision what size this county can or should become. If we are at 20,000 residents today, we need to take a long look at our waste transfer station, associated costs, and what will be done with that trash as more housing and people are encouraged to reside here. The road system and trash system should be at the front of these discussions, not after they are impacted and turn out to be insufficient.

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/1/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	<p>RE:The Basic Problem and Issue -- Social Engineering</p> <p>It was interesting to read the Ben Ellis quotes in today's front page article. The Jackson Hole community has said over and over again, that we want STABILITY in our neighborhoods, and permanent protection of wildlife/open space resources.</p> <p>Yet Ben and some others have taken that clear message and turned it on its head. Fictional and temporary down-zoning would be used as an excuse to up-zone immediately for "work force housing" levels advocated by the Housing Authority. That would be pure social engineering by some politicians and government planners. Coupled with Ben's threat to dump up-zoning density in other neighborhoods, if removed from the Aspens! To me that is a bullying "divide and conquer" tactic by Ben, and it is dead wrong.</p> <p>We already have a Valley where 68% of the people who live here, work here. The remaining second home people are an important part of our history and our economy, not the enemy. Do we really need to up-zone and urbanize Jackson in order to ward off second home owners and to bring in more people from Driggs and Alpine? I think not.</p> <p>I have enclosed the 2010 Housing Authority "Blue Ribbon Panel" findings which are the basis for Ben's current up-zoning and subsidized housing campaign.</p> <p>P.S. -- Great Letters to the Editor today. Thank you Kristine, Justin and Kathy.</p> <p>Teton County and Jackson planners have been pushing a basic re-do of Comprehensive Plan provisions which have been in effect for 18 years. Neighborhoods would be targeted for commercial and residential up-zonings. The only additional protection of open space and wildlife resources would come from selected down-zoning-- with no permanent protection of these valuable open space and wildlife resources. Unlike the existing clustering/open space provisions in our Plan.</p> <p>We believe that this approach is unwise, and would lead to increased urbanization of Jackson Hole with an adverse impact on wildlife, on open space, and on the great community character which attracts so many residents and visitors to our Valley.</p> <p>Much of the vitality of our community comes from the intense protective feelings so many of us share, for this very special place. Please contact our Teton County Commissioners at commissioners@tetonwy.org and the Jackson Town Council at electedofficials@ci.jacksonwy.us and urge them to keep Jackson Hole and its neighborhoods STABLE, to resist the urge of some planners to transition this Valley into a more urban community.</p> <p>This is an absolutely critical time, because errors of this kind really cannot be undone. Please take some time to comment. It is very, very important. We hope that you join all of us in caring deeply about our community, our wildlife/open space resources, and our friendly small town character.</p> <p>Village Road Coalition Wilson Advisory Committee South Park Neighbors North of Town Neighbors Cottonwood Park Neighbors East Jackson Neighbors</p>
2/1/2012	Costello, M. E. Interested Public	<p>I have a home at 2665 Tucker Ranch Road on the West Bank</p> <p>This email is urge you not to allow our wonderful community to become pockets of high density development. Jackson is the most wonderful community in the west and to change its character in this manner would be disastrous.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/1/2012	Huff, Mercedes Interested Public	<p>Thank you for taking the time to read this letter and listen to my comments. I know this has been an arduous process and it's close to the end – which is why it is SO critical to get it right and not ruin our precious valley.</p> <p>I am writing to you today because there is a strong inclination on the part of some of you to increase the density in the area of the Aspens by 300+ residential units. That is not to say that I'm not enormously concerned about the Valley as a whole. This same thinking will be replicated in other areas of the Valley. The product of four years of planning was given to you last March and you overturned what the public had so strongly asked for. Through many public hearings and letters written to planning commissioners it was agreed that the idea of upzoned "nodes" was not the direction the people of Teton County wanted to go. But lo and behold, you decided to do that anyway. Under the guise of preserving wildlife, you're proposing to remove people's property rights in the more rural areas by downzoning them and transferring those development rights to these "nodes" or "character districts" which will become very dense towns of their own. I can't think of anything less in keeping with the character of the valley. How can you take away someone's property rights (without guaranteeing any permanent protection of those areas for open space) and then shove them into another area where they aren't wanted?</p> <p>The basic problem here is that too much density is being created. The 1994 Comprehensive Plan had a population cap which most people have expressed they would like to see DECREASED. What this New Plan proposes to do will actually INCREASE development.</p> <p>Much of the vitality of our community comes from the protective feelings so many of us share for this very special place. We didn't choose to live in a place that could become like Park City, Vail or the like. I strongly encourage you to keep Jackson Hole STABLE, to resist the urge of some planners to transition this Valley into a more urban community. This is an absolutely critical time, because this kind of error and bad planning will have disastrous results that can't be undone.</p> <p>Some might ask why, as a real estate broker, I am opposing this dense development.</p> <p>THE ANSWER IS SIMPLE – IT'S THE RIGHT THING TO DO. LESS IS MORE!</p>
2/1/2012	Rogers, Nancy and John Interested Public	Please, please, please, keep Jackson Hole Stable. We do not want a more urban community!!!
2/1/2012	Jern, Sherrie Interested Public	<p>When I attended the meeting on January 26, I heard one of the county planning commissioners say "no one wants density in their back yard and the growth at Teton Village will break 390's back anyway, so why not break it now."</p> <p>I disagree on many levels. Increased density in Teton County, for me is not relative to just my personal backyard.</p> <p>I consider all residents of Teton County to be my neighbors and all of Teton County to be my back yard. I (and many others) also believe that the thousands of homes allowed to yet be built under the 1994 Comprehensive Plan is all that our "neighborhood" can physically support.</p> <p>To use the term "NIMBY" promotes division and prejudice when you are assuming to know the beliefs of residents working to protect this Valley for all of their neighbors now and into the future. Increased density in any area affects us all.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/1/2012	McIntyre, Julie Interested Public	<p>Most residents in Teton County made a personal choice, really, a commitment to live in this splendid place. We could have stayed in cities or the 'burbs and perhaps enjoyed greater monetary reward, but we made the choice to be near nature and live here. I am concerned that density "spots" continue to be a moving target in our Comprehensive Plan. If one targeted zone has the good fortune to be "saved" because of its perceived intrinsic value, then the thinking seems to be that another area must open up. Why? As far as the wildlife are concerned, this is one ecosystem that they live in and travel through all year. Maybe it's time to stop aspiring to be Boulder/Austin/etc., and appreciate where we are: living in a relatively unwrecked ecosystem with healthy wildlife yet abiding.</p> <p>In short: please uphold our rural values with the highest priority to protect wildlife. Teton County residents have strongly expressed and supported this throughout the CP process. ALL neighborhoods are valuable, we don't want more density, we are asking for predictability and conservation. When can enough be enough?</p>
1/31/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	<p>The attached policy ad will be running in the Daily this week, and the two weeklies on Wednesday, February 8 next week.</p> <p>Peter</p> <p>Teton County planners have been pushing a basic re-do of Comprehensive Plan provisions which have been in effect for 18 years. Selected neighborhoods would be targeted for commercial and residential up-zonings. The only additional protection of open space and wildlife resources would come from selected down-zoning- with no permanent protection of these valuable open space and wildlife resources.</p> <p>Unlike the existing clustering/open space provisions in our Plan.</p> <p>We believe that this approach is unwise, and would lead to increased urbanization of Jackson Hole with an adverse impact on wildlife, on open space, and on the great community character which attracts so many residents and visitors to our Valley.</p> <p>Much of the vitality of our community comes from the intense protective feelings so many of us share, for this very special place. Please contact our Teton County Commissioners at commissioners@tetonwy.org and urge them to keep Jackson Hole and its neighborhoods STABLE, to resist the urge of some planners to transition this Valley into a more urban community.</p> <p>This is an absolutely critical time, because errors of this kind really cannot be undone. Please take some time to comment. It is very, very important. We hope that you join all of us in caring deeply about our community, our wildlife/open space resources, and our friendly small town character.</p> <p>Village Road Coalition South Park Neighbors Wilson Advisory Committee North of Town Nieghbors</p>
1/30/2012	Delorme, Carrie Interested Public	<p>i would like to comment on the article in the jackson hole news & guide today about commissioners removing the Aspens from the "high-density" area of growth. they are wondering now where to put the additional housing they approved in the plan. i say NOWHERE.</p> <p>reduce it and remove it from the plan. who says you need growth and development? development should be capped almost completely. the town of jackson and the surrounding areas are congested and over-developed to begin with. ever try driving through town???</p> <p>growth inevitably means higher property taxes, higher cost of living, and lower standard of living. it's not necessarily a good thing.</p> <p>continued growth leads eventually to places like chicago, new york, los angeles. i know nobody wants to say it but everyone is thinking it - NO MORE GROWTH!</p>
1/26/2012	Sharkey, Steve Interested Public	<p>My name is Steve Sharkey and I live in South Park. I love this Village Road Coalition. It's like fresh troops getting sent into a battle, you know, when you're getting beaten and all of a sudden they send in new troops and that's kind of fun. I really just want to thank you for the great job that you did. The Plan that came out of the Planning Commission after...was a good plan, it really was. And it's tragic, in my opinion, what the electeds did to it. I don't have a lot of confidence you're going to be able to have much influence with them, but with ditto to most of the comments that have been made tonight, I really think you did a great job. It's a huge amount of work; you don't get paid for it, and I really appreciate it. You know, if I was going to suggest anything, I'd say flip the process. These guys decided to have nodes and decide where they were going to put a lot of growth and saying it's all going to be density neutral. Let's then flip it. Let's figure out where the density's going to come from first, you know. Do TDRs work? Maybe not, based on what we've heard. Can you down zone it? Figure that out. There's really some density there and if you get some of that, give it to I think Jay's left...I'd give it to Jay and let them upzone his property. But thank you for your efforts; you did a great job, I appreciate it, and I hope you can influence the electeds.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Quinn, David Interested Public	<p>David Quinn, I've lived in Wilson for the last 15 years and my family's lived in Teton County for a long time. First of all, I'd like to sort of ditto the last comment. I sat through, I don't know how long, a couple of years of planning meetings and I think that both Planning Commissions presented a very extraordinary Plan to the County Commissioners, and I think a lot of good thoughts were put forward. You know, a lot of public comment very similar to public comment that I've heard tonight from the Land Trust, from many conservation groups, from many landowners, landowners coming from, you know, many parts of the Valley, including Alta, and I think there was a consensus that, you know, the PRD tools, noncontiguous PRD tools, and many other tools should be left on the table. The nodes, you know, clustering in appropriate areas close to existing development. I think the language actually in the ?? as far as clustering goes north and south next to existing development, I mean, I agree with. You know, even Rich Bloom's comment that, you know, north is an appropriate place. I think that he also mentioned other landowners have moved their density north, that certainly next to existing development, you know, in certain parts of South Park in southern areas should be acceptable. You know, I was quite pleased, very pleased actually, with the document you presented to the County Commissioners. And, you know, I was totally floored, shocked, I don't know what you want to say, when this mapping process started with these nodes all of a sudden—you know, call it what you want—came about, and I don't know exactly how it happened. And I don't know what can be done. And I don't know what influence you can put on the County Commissioners maybe to pull the mapping away, go back to the Plan that you presented, because I think, you know, the community is hysterical at this point. You know, I don't know what else to say, but, you know, I do appreciate your efforts. Thank you.</p>
1/26/2012	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	<p>Hello, Gail Jensen. I'm also a member of the Teton Village Road Coalition. And we grouped up because we feel...we all are feeling the same thing—it's called the urbanization of Jackson Hole. I moved here, and most of us moved here, because we wanted a rural lifestyle. That's why we moved here, and that's what we want, and that's why people come here. It is not the intense dense development of the resource. I really am appalled that that looks like the direction we're headed. Town, the up zoning in Town is immense. I have always ?? in Town, Town Square, right off of Town Square on Center Street, and I am pleased that you have taken a step back for the two-story around Town Square, but immediately behind that is three and possibly even more stories. And if you add up all those areas that you ?? your Town Plan, it's immense growth, and it doesn't relate to what the residential densities can be in Town. So, I take a different look at it. Where are you going to put all the employees and all the people that are going to have to work in those commercial areas. But you're going to have to have the nodes outside in the County to house them. So, I look at it in the opposite direction, and a couple of other people have spoken about. But my main problem is is the urbanization of Jackson Hole. It's not what I want. It's not what a lot of people in the community wants. And I really think you need to take a step back and follow what the community wants. It's, you know, it's our souls, we're selling our souls. Are we selling it for the dollars? I don't see the dollars coming into the community with this growth. I don't know where the motivation really is. I don't know where it's coming from, because it's certainly not coming from the community at large. Please, please reconsider...please. Thank you.</p>
1/26/2012	Genzer, Jim Interested Public	<p>I'm Jim Genzer; I've lived in the community for 40 years, 38 of that right next door on Snow King Drive. And I would like, first of all, to say Patty Ewing's comments for Southeast Jackson is very appropriate to keep it as single-family housing. I think our numbers are very, very unrealistic, as Bill has mentioned. Doubling the size of the number of residences in the community is absolutely wrong. The double the size of commercial is absolutely wrong. Increasing areas like the Aspens and the Village by little pieces and then turn around and dumping the rest of the growth in the Town of Jackson is absolutely wrong. That is not the way things should happen. We...in the Town, the core commercial and resort areas to be expanded out to the...it used to be the Y, now the X, is a silly, silly thing. It will eliminate the western flavor, the western atmosphere that we have had for generations in Jackson Hole. That is not what we should be doing. If we want to be in step with a western community and the rest of the State of Wyoming, we will not do that kind of development. Can you imagine driving from the Y into Town with three-, four-story buildings in a dead zone? The only thing you can see is the antennas on top of Snow King. We're no different than any other city USA. If we want to keep the character of Jackson Hole, we do not allow the Town of Jackson to become the dumping ground for the community. None of this three-, four-story housing. We keep the character that we have right now. I think that, in order to do that, we have to eliminate the idea of having 65 percent of our employees housed in Teton County. That will not work. If we expect growth, 65 percent is wrong, and at a maximum, I would say 45 percent of employees that live in Teton County. And I thank you for the time that you have taken to listen to us and I really hope it engenders some revisions and attitude changes within our County and Town officials. Thank you.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Coon, Dave Interested Public	<p>Hi, Dave Coon; I currently live west of Town on East Bank. Just first I want to say thanks to the immense amount of effort. A lot of new faces I haven't spoken at for awhile, but thanks to all of you. I'm aware of what's going on in a lot of the Plan. Not a lot gets through my household without some review. I'm not going to speak on real specifics on character districts, things like that, but probably on a broader scale. I'm horribly concerned about how we're going to pay for this growth. And I'm just talking mainly entitled growth that's already on the books. It doesn't come free; there are costs for infrastructure and such. I sent some wild estimates that...Paul Nash said wild. So, you've got some serious planning to do. I'm not talking just in the light of this next Plan for ten or fifteen years, but I'm talking the next Comprehensive Plan and the next Comprehensive Plan. Some of this stuff is 50 years out, but you have to pay for it. And these are big things that go along with this, so I'd like to see some direction and language, maybe an implementation policy, in the Plan that looks that way at least. There's not much in there that really deals with these fiscal aspects that are way down the road. So, just consider those and again thanks. And actually thanks to Staff and the diligent public out there that...a lot of new faces. It's been a process. I don't agree with all of it. I agree with a lot of it and it's a good process. So, thanks.</p>
1/26/2012	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	<p>Good evening, I'm Trevor Stevenson, I'm here to speak on behalf of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. And, Planning Commissioners, I'd like to begin by thanking you for your many years of collective work on the Comprehensive Plan. What I'd like to do tonight, there are some overarching issues that I'd like to bring to your attention, so that you can keep the big picture in mind as you work tonight. First of all, the character district maps define goals for the future more specifically than the policies did by describing the desired future of each specific area of Town and County. We need to be clear that actually achieving any of these goals is very far from sure. Success hinges on coming up with effective regulations to guide development in a way the community desires. And therefore the Alliance has requested that a detailed implementation plan be developed which should outline major tasks ahead and include a timeline and a budget explaining how we get from describing goals to actually having the regulations needed to achieve them. As you work tonight, please take some time to flag issues that you think need additional work after the Comp Plan is adopted, so that these can be incorporated into the implementation plan. Since we don't yet know how we're going to actually shift development, we don't actually, therefore, know how much development we can really shift. And you're likely to run into this problem repeatedly tonight, as I expect you'll hear from many members of the public that's concerned. Next I would like to say that a much clearer statement of intent is needed, explaining that it is a actual shift in development that is desired, not simply an increase in additive growth in some areas. First, please recommend that a statement be added to the introduction explicitly saying that any increases in development should be accompanied directly, or linked directly, to decreases in other districts; otherwise, they simply don't match the intent of the Plan. We do believe that this is already the intent of the Plan and we feel that it should be a green change to add that additional language, but it is extremely important because it's not yet clear enough. Finally, I would like to clarify why the Alliance believes it is important to provide information about the amount of growth that is actually desired in each district. Clearly stating approximately what the intention is in terms of the amount of growth would provide much greater predictability for the residents in each area and would enable a broader conversation about what this Plan really means. The Alliance believes that explaining the amount of development desired in each district is important for a wide range of planning reasons; however, this is also the best way to illustrate how the Plan will achieve community goals and we think this is the best way to increase residents' understanding of and support for the Comp Plan. We recognize that some of you believe that releasing this information would cause a community uproar and derail the Plan. And we disagree. The Alliance believes that being transparent with this information is the best way to address the clear concerns that have been expressed by residents for many years. As you work through the character districts this evening, please take time and think about how much more clear all of this would be if the amount of development was much more clearly explained. So, in a nutshell, three things—implementation plan, look for things that need to go into that; second, link increases to decreases much more explicitly throughout the Plan; third, look at the how more helpful it would be to have the desired amount of growth in each district, rather than just a description of the type of growth. Thank you again for considering our recommendations.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	<p>My wife's waiting at home. Peter Moyer, I live on the Village road and I spend my working hours in Town. Whatever I say here is really directed to the County Planning Staff and the County Planning Commissioners, because it relates to the jurisdiction ?? and that jurisdiction is the County, not the Town. I've spent most of my working life, waking hours, in Town but I don't get to vote for it and it's really a County issue to me. So again, Town guys, I mean nothing critical whatsoever towards you. By way of perspective, the County Commissioners, a number of years ago, appointed a TDR Task Force, Transferrable Development Rights Task Force. Steve Duerr was the Chairman; he did a wonderful job. It was all over the spectrum. We had Kelly Lockhart and others on the landowners side. They had Alliance people, Nancy Hoffman and others, and a lot of people in between. We looked at models of transferrable development rights, which is essentially exactly what's being proposed by the Staff now. It's exactly what's being proposed. It's transferring density out of open space, wildlife areas, into places that are already built. That's what's going on. We looked at that in detail. There were good things, because under that model we looked at, it was permanent conservation easements from the sending areas. It wasn't subject to rezonings or anything. It was permanent protection. And then for landowners it wasn't a down zoning, which is highly controversial for a lot of landowners. It wasn't that. It was purely voluntary and they got compensated. If they wanted to transfer development rights, they could; they could get compensated if they wanted to and it was voluntary. We looked at the down side, though, and it was unanimous. There were about 14 of us. It was unanimous all across the spectrum. It was unfair and unworkable to use this model because a lot of the transferred development rights were fictional. They were phony, phantom, whatever you want to call them because they never would have been developed anyway. And some landowner could sit there and get money for development he never would have done on his own, or her own, property and send it into other neighborhoods far away, which was highly unfair. Again, it was unanimous—no! The County Master Plan that came in, what, 1994, had a much more responsible and less ambitious version of it, which was cluster, where for a given parcel, the benefit of the burden is right there, on that parcel, and it was permanent protection. Yet, the landowner was voluntary and they got compensated. The landowner got additional development rights if they had permanent protection of open space areas and cluster. And it's worked for almost 20 years now. SRA started out as something like 42 acres of dedicated open space. Finally, they went to that model that the Billy Resor actually came up with on the Planning Commission and it was over...I believe it was over 1,400 acres of permanent dedicated open space is where it ended up, up in Teton Village. That worked and it's worked for a lot of landowners. I look at what's going on now and what's being proposed and have gone through all of this stuff, all of this stuff. You can hardly...I read the report and it's like the Internal Revenue Code, or it might as well be written in Russian. What's actually going on here is, if you look at the three key groups, if you look at landowners, if you look at conservationists, if you look at old-time Jackson Hole neighborhoods, and you look at the overall community, too, in terms of not many people want this place urbanized. So how does this parse out? For landowners, if government need it, it's a down zone. It's not voluntary for these landowners, whether it's down zoning it in NC zones or eliminating or reducing the clustering. The landowner gets nothing in terms of compensation. And if like government need it, they are down zoned. Not a good thing for landowners. For conservation, there's no permanent protection. It's just zoning. It's down zoning. And that could be changed a day later, or a week later, two weeks later, two years later, five years later. There's no permanent protection. And I have not heard one single detail from the Planning Staff of how they plan to have real permanent protection. It doesn't exist on this...yeah, I'll get there in a second. From the conservation side as well, a lot of what fueled conservation easements, which is great, is the clustering rules, because then you've got federal tax deductions, estate and income tax deductions, gift tax deductions, and it's a huge incentive. This proposal would essentially devastate that whole model. And then for the neighborhoods, I think you probably have a sense now that it's not real popular in the neighborhoods where you want to dump this density. And a lot of the density is phantom density. It's phantom. You look at who benefits. Who benefits? Well, landowners don't; conservationists don't; old-time neighborhoods don't. Who benefits? Well, look at the receiving areas. There's a tiny little bunch of landowners who benefit. Who is the major landowner who benefits from these up zonings? It's Teton County itself, County government, because they bought five acres, five acres by the Aspen, right next to the Aspens on March 17th, 2007; they paid 1.95 million dollars for it, which was a million dollars over the then current appraised value at the height of the market...[Crosstalk]...I know, I'll be right...in just one second more. And they have a lot of... I know, but this is...it's an enormous conflict of interest, because the government is looking to up zone itself. This is a fundamentally flawed scheme that's being promoted by some people with very little transparency. It's hide the ball, and it's fundamentally an enormous conflict of interest for the government. That is what is going on. You are all public servants. You don't get paid on the Planning Commission; the Planning Staff does. It's public service; it's serving the public. It's not, you know, it's not your own personal agendas. It's serving the public and that's what matters. This is that letter. Thank you.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Jorgensen, Pete Interested Public	<p>I'm sorry, Pete Jorgensen and I live in Town. First, I've been involved in planning here since the '50s, having served as the local coordinator for the RUDAT study focused on South Park. Very simple and very straight forward; none of the recommendations in here were involved. I'd like to comment first on the fact that I don't know as much as you folks do <<inaudible>>. But I do appreciate these opportunities to make comments. I submitted written comments a couple of years ago, which I tried to review at your last public comment meeting ??, so I will keep this very short. And any comments I make tonight should not be taken personally, certainly not by these boards; the County Commissioners, that's another thing. I saw the first diagram you put up and it reminded me of something I saw in previous business, not here, somewhere else. The company I was working for did projects in Vietnam and somebody got and they drew three overriding circles or interlocking circles and tried to explain it that way. And, I'm sorry, I'm probably getting more dense as I get older, but I just don't understand where this is going, when the County has made such a commitment to open space, wildlife preservation, 97 percent federal land, which we hope is protected, conservation easements over 10,000, and I don't know exactly how many. I was a member of the three families who did the first nature conservancies in Wyoming at Skyline Ranch, four hundred dollars and 600 acres permanently preserved. I don't think we got anything out of it; we didn't have enough income to take a tax credit. But that's the history of this Valley. And I guess I don't want to say we shouldn't grow, but I will say the County shouldn't grow. We should split the County and the Town apart for purposes of long-range planning. The Town as Heart makes a lot of sense, but when you look at the implications of growth anywhere, and ultimately that's what happens right through the Village, it's easy to understand why WYDOT says, you've got to have the three lanes or five lanes. They project traffic 20 years in the future. Every projection that has been made in this County has been met or exceeded. There's no effort, no meaningful, serious effort by the planning entities, and again it's not you folks—it's the County Commissioners who have that authority to limit growth or control what happens. They were spending 80 percent on construction that was federal money; they have requirements that it meet certain standards. That's their job. They will do their job eventually. The second thing...and the third thing is the districts. And that's...15 districts is fine but the ones that make up the Town, Town as Heart are the important ones to consider more density. I don't know whether it should be there or not. We'll talk about that when you get to that point. But I urge you to try and take care of the County lands. Things Peter spoke to, there are not many properties left that have not been developed that would lend themselves to a large development where you would actually gain a conservation easement in exchange for density. So I would urge you to look carefully at the map and see what you're really talking about. You're clearly talking about the north end of South Park. That's been kicked down the road for 20 years, 30 years. And I'm not sure waiting for infill in Town is doing anything more than just delaying some definitive action that shows some limits. The timeline is another thing I would like to see, and I keep thinking these meetings are a chance that somebody is going to say that this is the deal and recommend it and the elected officials adopt it. But so far I don't have a sense of where we're going and when we're going to get there and I'd really like to have that. Thank you very much.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	<p>Hi, I'm Becky Tillson, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. I wanted to start by thanking all of you guys for the enormous amount of time you've served the last couple of years. <<inaudible>>. So, thank you for all of that. Trevor covered earlier some of our most comprehensive ???. Those are also included in our written comments. I wanted to give just a couple of specific suggestions about the maps, district map on the ?? section. Overall, in the introduction, there needs to be a statement that clearly establishes the prioritization of wildlife and natural resources, which in this Plan is the well-documented will of the community. As we did for Buffalo Valley, it should be clear that choosing a goal of housing or workforce or whatever should not trump the top priority of wildlife protection. Also, in the introduction, the definition of conservation area should be clarified that we will not only be reducing impacts of development but actually the overall development potential in the area as well. And lastly—I think Greg mentioned this earlier—there needs to be a clear consideration of commercial development potential throughout the County ?? the need for housing and the amount and type of commercial development that works with ?? districts. Specific to the districts, there's just a couple of other things. In Districts #2 and 4, I think it would be important to clarify that Flat Creek enhancements are not only social but also <<inaudible>>. In District 2, we do agree that <<inaudible>>, but I just wanted to point out right now that we don't believe it's appropriate for the ?? to extend into District 4 unless it's really explicitly limited to existing nonconforming uses. District 5, <<inaudible>>. I think...I just wanted to make it clear that the idea is not to give an up zone in Northern South Park without first trying to do it elsewhere. It is a good idea to continue the discussion on linking development in this area to the growth management plan, and perhaps a solution maybe is to have linkage to the growth management plan include the caveat allowing for development that's associated with permanent open space protection ???. In District 6, I think I mentioned that it would be important to clarify that further subdivision should not be encouraged. District...the River Bottom District mentions ?? and I think that should be included in the Town and County Periphery districts as well. In #10, the wildlife corridors that was mentioned, that Rich was talking about, east/west, are important to point out. High-density development in the Aspens, which is an area with high wildlife values and existing road kill problems and transportation problems, as you all know, is not consistent with the goals of this Plan...high-density development in the Aspens is not consistent with the goals of the Plan. We don't know exactly how ?? is slated for that area, but it makes sense to really minimize that ???. In the Village, this new change that we've been talking about, about not increasing beyond the established footprint, we think it's a good idea, but we prefer to see the amount and type of that future growth. ?? development that will generate markets rather than ?? is really inappropriate. The balance of convenience commercial and workforce residential housing could be explored but only with some analysis of the <<inaudible>>. As we change the subdistrict lines, people should be able to maintain the rural character of that gateway area, preserving the rural character ?? really explicit having a change around the lines there. That's too much and I just wanted to thank you guys again for your years of service and ???. Thank you.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Swift, Phelps Interested Public	<p>Hi, my name is Phelps Swift. I know many of the people who have spoken here tonight are truly the all-time real leaders of the community, so I'm gratified that they're here, and I know you guys are here doing your job and you're probably sick of it just as we are. But we were passionate about where we are and where we're going and you're hearing from that firsthand. We built a...we moved to Teton Village Road in the 1970s, so I've lived in ??, ended up buying property in Melody Home in Raintree subdivision in 1985, which is part of your Aspens/Teton Pines, District 12, I think it is. And the first thing I want to talk about here just briefly has been the process, and it's been a long and flawed and very confusing process. I'm glad Pete Jorgensen was here ???. It's been hard to follow where we are, where we're going, and what the timeline is, so it would be very helpful. And I kind of think I'm involved, I'm a local lawyer, and I read the LDRs, but it's been hard for me to follow the iterations, imaginations. In one week the nodes are soundly defeated—I think they were thrown out by you guys. Suddenly, they're revised in character district maps under a different camouflaged name. So, except for the professional planners and a few very diligent watchdogs over here tonight, Staff members and those with an agenda, like affordable housing and the Housing Authority, the public, the real stakeholders, haven't been here. Now, they've been worn out, they've been divided, they've been conquered by the process. And so what we have is not really a community plan, in my opinion. I think it's been contrived by the Staff and please don't...I don't fault you; I'm kind of in Pete Jorgensen's camp. I think it's their Plan and it's hard to get an audience with them, and I've tried to be respectful and not bother them at home. So, in any event, the 2009 map, you'll remember, was released and there was a great outrage by the public, then they pulled the maps, everything became fluff, warm and fuzzy. Then there was calm, nobody knew what was going on. It kind of made sense. Now you've released the character maps more ?? and, you know, we're not going away. So, I really think what the Staff and the electeds need to do is measure the quality of the comments and the people who the comments are coming from, not just the quantity. And you've got some real leaders here tonight saying a lot of good things. And I respect them and I appreciate them. I know there are both sides, but I really think the comments you're hearing tonight are meaningful. I'm part of this new group called the Village Road Coalition. We didn't think we needed to organize a campaign. We thought we could do it individually, you know, we're still Wyoming and we're pretty independent. Obviously, the Housing Authority has had a campaign over the five acres. We haven't done that. We've been kind of easy targets. We're a small group; we're not a gated community; we're not a berm community. We don't even have an owners association. We're not ?? by SPET or other public money. We're only organized now and I think that's a sad, sad statement. I talked to one of the electeds the other night and he said I'm glad you finally organized and why don't you start a PAC because then we'll listen to you. Listen to these individuals. We don't need to be organized. We don't need a PAC. I think you're...the ivory tower approach to this thing—I need to make this point—it really fails to account for what's going on on the ground. You've got 15 acres in this so-called transitional space in the Raintree subdivision. Mind you, this is a platted subdivision, three-acre lots, it's been that way for 35 years. This is only for 35 years; these are platted lots; they can't be divided, some even have open space on them; they've got private restrictions. I think it's just driving this Housing Authority agenda for this mistake they made to buy this five acres. I think what's been happening out here is tantamount to a condemnation of our property, our values, our lifestyles. And one of the real centerpiece common values in your Plan is to preserve community character. Again, 34 years our neighborhood's been zoned the same way, three acres, neighborhood conservation, and by the stroke of a single pen, overnight, you want to convert these—not you but the Plan would convert these—into neighborhood destruction, not conservation. It will be the biggest density dump in the history of the Teton County right in our residential subdivision. And I think you've heard enough tonight—we don't want it. So, I, for one, am very skeptical. I haven't trusted the planning process. I don't think I'm alone. I think existing, conserved neighborhoods should be preserved, and then if you want to change them, you should have an open process so the debate can happen and negotiations can occur just like they did at Shooting Star and you end up with a good project. You just don't want to ???. So, to be very specific, I'd like you to reclassify the Core Residential from the Aspens/Pines—I think it's section 4.2—into a kind of a conserved, I think it is, maybe stable, I'm not quite sure of the terminology, but leave it how it has been and let us go on with life. Thank you.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	<p>Armond Acri, representing Save Historic Jackson Hole. I want to start off by saying I think the product that you guys did when you had the Plan originally was excellent. You guys listened to the community. It wasn't...we didn't get everything we wanted, but I think the work was good. Staff did a good job. Unfortunately, when the electeds took over, the emphasis shifted from get it right to get it done now. Your efforts resulted in a Plan that we refer to as "our Plan." Right now, it's referred to as "their Plan." There is no ownership. This should be cause for concern. I'd like to talk to some of the reasons now why that there is this lack of ownership right now. A lot of discussion in the meeting two weeks ago on how many stories are okay. What I heard was about not being able to see stories. All the talk was about hiding the stories so that we can't see them, but there was no talk about the impacts. That is really why people are asking for numbers. That is where the concern comes from. What do we need to accommodate the growth? WYDOT, as an example, we challenged...Save Historic Jackson Hole challenged the WYDOT figures for South Highway 89, which were based on numbers that came from the elected officials. It turned out that the numbers were way, way higher, the growth numbers, for South Highway 89, so we're not doing what we said we're doing. We're hiding when we ignore these numbers. We vilify WYDOT when all they're doing is responding to the growth that we allowed to happen. What we end up with is bigger schools on a road...build schools on a road that's failing, the bigger bus line. When Bruce gets up here, he's probably going to throw on his cute cheerleader outfit, fire up the smoke machine and tell you what a great Plan this is. No parent thinks their child is ugly. The reality is an analysis of the Comp Plan by Alan Richman identified a number of issues, some of which Trevor mentioned, that need to be addressed before we can claim this is truly a visionary Plan. Almost nothing has been done to resolve these issues. One of them is this issue of an implementation plan. The community has asked for numbers because they want to see some kind of accounting for the hand waves. Right now, it's we're going to put a little more here and take a little away there. And we'd like to see more than just the hand waves. That's why we've asked for the numbers. The growth management plan is reactive, it's not proactive. It gives no assurance that you can achieve the goals during the Plan and that's why we'd like to see the numbers. You might achieve the 60/40 split. Can you hold it to the economy? We don't know and maybe it doesn't matter anyway because the Comp Plan is only aspirational, it's not legal. We ask that you tell the elected officials that the Plan is incomplete without some sort of implementation plan that identifies the timeline for major changes that are planned to accomplish the goals in this Plan, and this must include some kind of numbers facing the County for these hand waves. When isn't as important as how much. If you fail to provide numbers, you have failed to plan. Thank you.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	<p>I am hopefull that you will do right by the people of Jackson Hole who have worked hard to make this plan fair to all.</p> <p>Under Illustrating our Vision it states that "Realizing our vision means proactively planning for what we want – rural open spaces and high quality complete neighborhoods – and identifying where we want them. Our Vision and Common Values describe how we will direct development toward suitable areas in order to preserve and protect the ecosystem and design development to enhance our quality of life. The Illustration of Our Vision identifies where those suitable areas are located. As important as location, is the type of preservation or development desired. Unlike the past, a principle of growth management in this Plan is predictable implementation. By defining the desired character for each area of the community, all community members know what to expect as a result of preservation and development regulations and incentives. In areas suitable for development, the Illustration of Our Vision describes how we will protect the character we love while ensuring that the development contributes to the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. The Illustration of Our Vision also describes how we will preserve and enhance all other areas to provide wildlife habitat, wildlife connectivity, scenery, and open space. The community is committed to continually adapting our implementation strategies to ensure preservation and development occurs in the desired amount, location, and type. This can only be realized if we define desired location and character for the preservation and development. Adapting our implementation also requires rigorous analysis of our successes and failures. The Illustration of Our Vision defines existing, baseline character in addition to desired future character; allowing implementation strategies to be adapted based on analysis rather than theory. Our community's many districts share common values, but also have unique identities. While each of our community's policies is important to achieving our Vision, not all policies apply community wide. Each individual preservation and development project should be a contributing piece in the community wide plan for achieving our Vision. The Illustration of Our Vision is the community wide picture of where we will place all the pieces – ensuring that all policies of this Plan are implemented in the context of our Vision and no policies are forgotten."</p> <p>We can improve the district maps by including what our our community has always called for and has stated so in OUR vision above. If we don't, the latter part of the above which states that "allowing implementation strategies to be adapted based on analysis rather than theory" will be in fact the opposite. Without the projected growth numbers for each district and over all for town and county, we will be theorizing our way into a quagmire that only developers could love.</p> <p>Please focus on decreasing development in desirable areas rather than focusing on where growth should go. Focusing on just growth areas will lead to careless development planning and cost overruns that will hurt everyone. Also work with the Land Trust and large land owners by providing incentives to permanently retire development rights. The Land Trust is very important to the success of the comprehensive plan.</p>
		<p>Being from Cottonwood Park I would like to repeat the some of the recommendations that JHCA has submitted to the process.</p> <p>District 5: West Jackson</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Recommendation: Section 5.2 should be amended to recognize that this area is already trending towards housing and complete neighborhood attributes, and should be encouraged to continue to do so, given the close proximity to schools, a grocery store, pathways and Flat Creek. This is an ideal location for "complete neighborhood" attributes, but given recent developments, it is no longer a particularly good location for industrial uses. Industry should be focused into District 7.b. Recommendation: Section 5.4 should commit to repurposing High School Road primarily as a residential access road and not a highway.c. Recommendation: Section 5.6 needs to be clarified with regard to the lower priority of development in northwest South Park.
		<p>You can either ruin High School road with theories or go by the numbers. You can't have industrial growth and have a safe environment for school zones and the neighborhoods around them. Hopefully you read my letters in the past pushing for a campus road that promotes safety and less traffic on High School Road. It is so important now that the district map is calling for expansion of the school zone on High School Road. Please respect our wishes as property owners with rights too. We are not looking to make money off of it. We are just looking to preserve our land and it's value as a</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Huff, Mercedes Interested Public	<p>great family neighborhood.</p> <p>I am Mercedes Huff and I have been a full-time resident for the last four years and I've sold real estate for the last 33 or plus years, and I have to say that one of the things that made my job so enjoyable is that I've always been proud to show off our Valley and talk about how responsibly it's been planned and how it will be maintained with the same stewardship in the years to come. Right now, I think that's being threatened; I don't feel that way. I think it's critical that we, you know, keep its unique value or we're just going to be Park City, ??, Aspen, and even Sun Valley. It's a huge thing that we're looking at here and I'm very, very concerned. I was standing here tonight talking on my own personal behalf but also for the Teton Village Road Coalition, which has been recently formed to...so that we can get a group voice out here to you. I've not addressed this board before. I have talked to the County Commissioners and written letters. You know, I just don't feel that it's been heard, so I feel...we all feel that, as a group, we hopefully can have a stronger voice. There are a lot of people obviously who couldn't get here tonight; either they're out of Town or the weather prevented it. But I would ask the same question I've asked the County Commissioners and everyone else—Why are we here? Why are you insisting...or why are they insisting on completely redoing this Comprehensive Plan? And as you've been reminded many times, the mandate was to make ??, not to completely rewrite this Plan, not an overhaul. When I first asked one of the planners years ago why we had to come up with such overarching rules and new concepts for these density nodes, I was told it was too cumbersome in its current form to have to ask for variances whenever a property owner might want to do something a little outside of what was currently permitted. What could be more cumbersome, expensive, stressful than what we've all, whether Staff, Commissioners, or the populace at large, have experienced over the last four to five years? Personally, I think the variance method was a terrific built-in checks and balance system. Neighborhoods got input and there were no overreaching node themes or character districts to ruin large slots of the Valley. I'm very troubled by the concept of down zoning the rural areas and transferring that to proposed nodes. That seems to be a taking—I'm not an attorney—but it seems to be down zoning these landowners. The right to cluster on larger parcels and receive some density bonus in return has been a part of the Plan for a long time and it has real, real value to an owner. How can we just remove that right and tell the owner he now has to shift it to a node? Although my concerns are really about our Valley as a whole and how the vision you're contemplating seems very flawed and very detrimental to people and wildlife, I'd like to address one specific area, and it's been brought up tonight, and it is the five-acre parcel, which the Housing Authority bought on a gamble, with taxpayer money, that it would get up zoned. And they borrowed money, which I am...my understanding is it's against the rules for a public Housing Authority. Totally inappropriate and I hope you won't give any consideration for new zoning based on that and it shouldn't be a reason for you to contemplate adding enormous density to the Aspens. That would only be rewarding bad behavior and I think we've seen too much of that in the last few years...I think a lot of it. Thank you very much.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment														
1/26/2012	Coon, Dave Interested Public	<p>Over the last four years a tremendous amount of effort, thought and expense has gone into the re-write of the Comprehensive Plan that will be the guide our future growth, development and preservation of this great place I am privileged to call home. The whole process has been long, involved and tenuous. The results are good and I applaud all the participants, but some "tweaking" is still required.</p> <p>Let's look at the key words and some definitions:</p> <p>Comprehensive: Wide in scope; inclusive.</p> <p>Plan: A scheme for making, doing, or arranging something.</p> <p>For most of the current re-write, the intentions and wording reflect what the desires of the community were in terms of scope and inclusion, but some areas are not specific enough, too general or simply too vague to meet the true definition of a complete Plan. Before you recommend or approve this document, please consider the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•The current proposed language doesn't address the fiscal impacts (costs) of growth. Even with the entitled development already on the books, realistic infrastructure improvements could be astronomical. Here are some very basic estimates: <table><tbody><tr><td>-Roads/Highways/Wildlife mitigation</td><td>\$200 million</td></tr><tr><td>-Public Transportation</td><td>\$150 million</td></tr><tr><td>-Schools (6 more @ 30m)</td><td>\$180 million</td></tr><tr><td>-Sewer/Water Improvements</td><td>\$200 million</td></tr><tr><td>-Power Grid Improvements</td><td>\$200 million</td></tr><tr><td>-Public Buildings (hospital, airport, administrative, trash, etc.)</td><td>\$100 million</td></tr><tr><td>-Public Services (Fire, Police, Administrative, etc.)</td><td>\$150 million</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>As you can see, we will be looking at some serious future costs to provide basic services for anticipated growth during the next 40 to 50 years. Additional language pertaining to fiscal review, an implementation plan/schedule, etc., is warranted in this document. Don't expect people to keep voting for the SPET!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Current language doesn't adequately address the costs and impacts of additive growth to select character districts. Please allow only "already entitled" infill development in all character districts. Remember the pleas for predictability, preserving rural/neighborhood character and NO additive growth!•Current language doesn't clearly address an incentive mechanism for preserving wildlife/open space by transferring development to more appropriate areas. <p>Please keep in mind that anything you/we do regarding our human needs has a greater effect on the natural environment than one can imagine. The Rockefellers were looking forward into perpetuity with their vision; our Plan has an intended lifespan of only 10 to 15 years. Let's make John D extremely proud by approving the best plan possible. Thanks for all the great work!</p>	-Roads/Highways/Wildlife mitigation	\$200 million	-Public Transportation	\$150 million	-Schools (6 more @ 30m)	\$180 million	-Sewer/Water Improvements	\$200 million	-Power Grid Improvements	\$200 million	-Public Buildings (hospital, airport, administrative, trash, etc.)	\$100 million	-Public Services (Fire, Police, Administrative, etc.)	\$150 million
-Roads/Highways/Wildlife mitigation	\$200 million															
-Public Transportation	\$150 million															
-Schools (6 more @ 30m)	\$180 million															
-Sewer/Water Improvements	\$200 million															
-Power Grid Improvements	\$200 million															
-Public Buildings (hospital, airport, administrative, trash, etc.)	\$100 million															
-Public Services (Fire, Police, Administrative, etc.)	\$150 million															

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Griffith, Gregory Interested Public	<p>Gregory Griffith, West Bank. Five years, five hundred thousand dollars plus, 105 meetings plus. Are we really better off than we were five years ago? I say not. We've got so much of the big substantive discussions we need to have. We keep putting it off, we keep putting it off, it's at the next phase, it's at the next phase. Everyone pretty much acknowledges outside the ?? the psychology of the economy. I got into this process for one reason and one reason only, acknowledging that wildlife and open space. We can't have any substantive long-term beneficial or benefit to our wildlife without protecting more of the habitat they need to not only migrate but to move around on a daily fashion. We can't do that without permanent protection. This Plan is just completely turned on its ear from a permanent protection perspective. Everything hinged in early days on two issues primarily—affordable housing and the PRD, because without the clustering incentives, without some dedicated funding source, without a myriad or a mountain of some methodology to create this open space and to keep it...to perpetuate this little song of stewardship we have, everything else falls by the wayside. We can't do that without ?? Several people have spoken to this issue already. The ?? isn't about anything other than preventing the additive growth without having that ??, that nexus. To add to growth anywhere in the County cannot be achieved without permanent reduction elsewhere, or else we will end up essentially with the four horsemen of the overdevelopment apocalypse and that is density, sprawl, increased verticality, and the one nobody talks about, concentric expansion, which is exactly what's occurring now because they proposed expansion in the Aspens and in Northern South Park. It's absolutely ludicrous. I have a specific suggestion. I also count on Staff's numbers. It'd be nice if you guys would parse out the 4300 overage in the 6800 base entitlement and how that was arrived at. We were originally told the max PRD potential is 2900. I'd really like to see that parsed out, that number, that 4300 number that gets us to 11.1. A specific suggestion would be to eliminate...of the four categories, only have transitional and preservation. That's what people understand and most people think now that stable doesn't mean stable, it's simply the holding pattern for you'll be transitional next. So, if we're really serious about that, let's just have two categories—transitional and preservation. And that includes small town, community character, wildlife, scenic resources—the preservation of everything. There's been a stunning lack of acknowledgement throughout this process about amount of growth. Amount of growth is much more important in a constrained environment in which we live than location of growth. A lot of planners and architects, I understand all these principles as well as you guys do. I'd have that discussion with anybody in the room. In the constrained footprint that we're under, a lot of these new urbanistic and smart-growth principles have diminishing returns. That's not my opinion, that's actual data analysis. The quintessentially high and low development, sea of wilderness in public lands, assuredly as we're ??, we are constrained and islands have carrying capacities. They have carrying capacity both on qualitative and a quantitative standpoint, but we need to acknowledge that. The amount of growth is more important to the majority of the populace than location of growth. We should have adhered to the better-not-bigger premise and work with an existing footprint. Six point six million square feet, we're acknowledging a lack of critical thinking and critical problem-solving ability, if we can't work within that footprint. Six point six million square feet of commercial outstanding and 6800 base entitled units, especially in this economic time, we should be able to work within that footprint. There's also a lack of acknowledgement about the cost of growth. We keep projecting these growths, this growth and this growth pattern without considering a strong linkage to the cost of growth; most prominent among those are commercial and employee generation rates and our inability to house them where we want to, and that contribution to the commuter rate also should be considered.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Collins, Bill Interested Public	<p>Good evening, my name is Bill Collins and I live in East Jackson, Wyoming. I'm going to give you a bit of a different note tonight, I think, from a lot of the comments you've been hearing; I'm going to speak very generally, but I'm also going to speak very positively. I think this Plan that's on the table before you is a huge, huge improvement over the 1994 Comprehensive Plan. And having attempted to administer that Plan for more than a decade, it didn't influence a single decision the entire Town made, in fact. This Plan is really a very good step forward, and it actually does a lot of the things that we said for a decade that we'd like to do, and that is to de-emphasize and discourage development in the outlying areas and redirect it to the areas where there's infrastructure, where there's existing development. This Plan really does that and I think it's a very good step forward, and I think it ???. We all have our own things we can find in there we don't like. Mine is I think the character maps are far too complex and cumbersome and difficult to understand. I don't think they should be that way. There's been a concern throughout this process about additive growth. I've never understood this Plan to be one that attempted to increase the overall growth as currently allowed. I've never understood that to be an objective. And I don't think it ever has been. And what I would suggest to you, in an attempt to sort of respond to that, is to put a policy in this document that says that, as the LDRs are revised going forward, the maximum theoretical buildout of this County will be increased. It will just simply be increased from what it is today. It's going to work that way anyway. I mean, the whole process of rewriting the LDRs will have that effect; the marketplace is having that effect; existing development, prior to the great recession when there really was somebody proposing something, was taking advantage of that approximately 80 percent of maximum density allowed anyway. So, let's just sort of lower the temperature and put something in the Plan that says that we are going to lower the theoretical buildout of Town. I actually think that will respond to a lot of the comments that we're hearing and a lot of the fear that people have. I'm not sure how much density is proposed in each of these character districts or districts. I actually think that the amount of new development that could result from this Plan along Highway 390 should be very ???. And one of the objectives the community has had for a long time was to try to avoid a five-lane Highway 390 and that's been sort of an ongoing discussion with the Wyoming Department of Transportation. There's some very extensive transportation demand and management techniques that's in place in Teton Village, all sort of calibrated to try to avoid tripping five-lane requirement Highway 390. I would encourage you to keep that in mind when you think about the Aspens and Pines and what else you may do on that, along that corridor. This issue of down zoning versus TDR, well, I don't know, that is a difficult one. I never believed that TDRs is going to work here. The transfer of density from Buffalo Valley to the northwest corner of Herford Ranch, you've got to multiply that by 25 or 35 times before the economics begin to make any sense. And this community will never do that, ???. I just don't see how that's going to work. I think that the harsh reality of trying to put this Plan into effect is going to be done through zoning changes. I think that's the practical, realistic technique that we're going to find ???. But let me end where I began—this is a giant improvement from the 1994 Comp Plan. Thank you.</p>
1/12/2012	Pierson, Scott Interested Public	<p>Regarding the suggestion by Ben to constrain all districts with number limits there is a plan to disembowel any flexibility by policy makers in the future as the Plan evolves over the next 5-10 years.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
1/12/2012	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	<p>Alex and Bruce – I know Shawn took notes and you have the tapes, but following is my take on where the town landed on areas 5.6 and district 10 – let me know if I got it wrong.</p> <p>Area 5.6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •EW connector (South Park Loop to HWY 89) –Tie to development of 5.6. Split on need, intersection with HWY 89 causing problems, whether it would encourage development.... oSummary conclusion = soften language and mention it as "one of several possibilities" for traffic challenges in the area if that area is developed. •High School road – Summary conclusions = strengthen language to focus more improvements for pedestrians safety, school zone, reduce speed limits, traffic calming etc. as traffic "will always go there" oBasically that HS road needs to be addressed as both the EW connector and Tribal trail connector will not solve the problems on HS road •Tribal trails connector – Summary conclusion = no changes in language – leave as is •Timing of considering 5.6 for development – o"Infill first" language should be considered in all new areas (Mark O) – unsure that was generally agreed to or not? oTie are to growth management plan, urban growth boundary – all generally concurred oClarify "if necessary" language – make firm, defined, conditional - Melissa oClarify density - not just "adjacent neighborhoods" – which neighborhoods, Cottonwood Park or Ellenwood (Barbara) oSummary conclusion of Bruce = "tighten it up more, tie to growth management plan" <p>Area 10.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Summary conclusion = leave as written <p>Area 10.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Summary conclusion = leave as written – let the County review •Bob's comment – connectivity between subdivisions language "too aggressive" – not sure where that conversation ended? <p>Misunderstandings I noticed:</p> <p>Things I learned that you should consider in your introduction to the County group this afternoon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Clarify that all growth management goals are met in the identified transition areas while seeking conservation/preservation of the identified rural areas. oThat an important portion of the plan is to stay within "no more than twice the build environment" •Radio grounds – current location is committed under a 24 year lease to the fair board. •That the Tribal Trails connector and the east-west connector in area 5.6 are two different road sections. oThat there is an easement for Tribal Trails but not one for the theoretical east-west connector in area 5.6. •That the unmapped existing wildlife movement corridors east-west and north-south (apart from the identified Flat Creek corridor that you did map in areas 10.1 and 10.2) is causing some confusion (I know this is a green change I have pointed out – but the current missing wildlife corridors did influence the 10.2 discussion). <p>Items of importance to staff that were never brought up for discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •You never brought to discussion in 5.6 two red items of staff that should be discussed with the County: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o"Add allowance for location of PRD development" o"Add vision for redundant streets, variety of housing types, wildlife permeability if developed"

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
1/11/2012	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	<p>Just wanted to forward this red dot comment list from SHJH. I agree with these comments and strongly urge you to incorporate these logical and forward thinking comments in the character district maps. We need these clarifications that have been supported by the residents of Jackson Hole through out the 5 year comprehensive plan. The more clarification up front will prevent costly arguments and drawn out disagreements over future land development proposals.</p>
1/9/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	<p>If Save Historic Jackson Hole were allowed to participate in the "Red Dot" exercise this week, the attached list is where we would place our dots. After each dot is a brief explanation of why we would place our dots there.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The Plan must include building and density numbers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦A Plan without metrics isn't a real plan. •Any density increase must be balanced with density decrease. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦Permanent Protection of sensitive areas was and is the objective, not town growth. ◦Protection of sensitive areas is what was sold to the public and the promise needs to be kept. •No Zoning changes and density transfer until a mechanism is in place. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦With 50-70 years of growth already in the pipeline, we have time to get this right. •Protect rural character and small town atmosphere everywhere. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦Jackson Hole is all about small town rural character; that's what we are. ◦The current draft only extends this protection to the Town Square. •Eliminate contradictory and confusing definitions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦We can provide a list, but start with "stable" and "complete neighborhoods." •Do not encourage development in Northern South Park. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦Infill in Town before we sprawl south. ◦We do not want to refight the Porter Annexation battle. •Do not expand the Lodging Overlay. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦The existing overlay already allows for more lodging, where's the need to make it larger? We are rarely at full occupancy now. •No Density increase in difficult/sensitive areas. <p>The following areas all have access problems and are adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. They should not see increases in density.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦Between Broadway and Flat Creek in Midtown and Town Commercial Core. ◦Steep hillsides at the "Y" ◦Commercial development at the Aspens should not expand across 390.

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
1/9/2012	Andrews, Laurie JH Land Trust	<p>In recent weeks, we have received numerous requests from community groups, citizens, and elected officials to comment on the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan Update, which is now being considered for adoption. We are neither experts on community planning, nor advocates. We do, though, have over 30 years of experience in partnering with landowners to conserve open space in Jackson Hole. Drawing on that experience, we offer the following perspective on the areas of the plan that pertain to open space protection.</p> <p>Our last public comment on the plan, a May 14, 2009 letter, made three recommendations: 1) consider establishing a dedicated funding source for land conservation; 2) preserve development potential in rural areas as a strategy for conserving those areas; and 3) include provisions for clustering and/or transferring development rights. We stand by those recommendations and make the following additional observations.</p> <p>The plan makes many Key Points that align perfectly with our experience of how open space and wildlife habitat are conserved in Jackson Hole: the relationship between agriculture and open space protection; the importance of our valley's private lands in providing habitat and movement corridors for wildlife; the attributes of permanence and active stewardship that are essential to conservation easement-protected open space; the key role of ranchers and other private landowners as valuable stewards of these lands. These are all themes that we know from experience to be true and that we are encouraged to see reflected in the plan.</p> <p>The plan appears to wrestle with a tension between protecting open space through incentives versus through restrictions. In our experience, the best way to conserve meaningful open space is through incentives. This is how we work in a market based environment, with willing landowners. Setting aside the question of fairness, because of the base density rights that private landowners possess, we think it is impossible for this community to zone its way to strategic, high-quality open space.</p> <p>The plan expresses a goal of directing growth into areas of existing infrastructure and services, which the plan identifies as less than 5% of the private land in the county. Insofar as the purpose of that goal is to preserve high-quality open space and wildlife habitat in the remaining 95%, we think it is important that the plan recognize the market preference for base-density development and preserve and create incentives for the conservation of those areas that are capable of counteracting that preference. To put it another way, if you want something other than one unit per 35 acres in the rural area, the only way to get it is through incentives. These incentives should be both strong and diverse, as what works for one landowner in a key habitat area may not for his or her neighbor.</p> <p>Finally, we have increasingly found that smaller-scale conservation represents an important component of our land conservation strategy. Done thoughtfully, the conservation of smaller parcels both complements the protection of adjacent, larger parcels and over time can develop into a pattern of conservation that is greater than the sum of its parts. We have seen this play out in the conservation of numerous smaller parcels along the Snake River, for example, which today constitutes a meaningful network of conserved lands along this key natural feature in the valley. The Planned Residential Development (PRD) tool has been key to this work, as it is the only meaningful incentive for conservation on parcels smaller than 70 acres in size.</p> <p>As the land trust, we can bring to bear capital from private, state, and federal sources, as well as facilitate the federal tax incentives that have helped bring about so much conservation in the past. But to be successful in conserving open lands in Jackson Hole in the future, it is critical that the policies we identify above be included as other legs of the stool, so to speak.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide our perspective at this important juncture. We are grateful for the work of the town and county planning commissions, elected officials, and staff and all of the citizens and community groups who have contributed to the planning effort.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
1/6/2012	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	<p>Thank you for the intensive work all of you have been doing with the Comprehensive Plan in the last several months, and for your commitment to community goals.</p> <p>I am writing to explain why the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance believes it is important to verify that the new Character District Maps accurately illustrate overall community goals.</p> <p>We agree with your general approach to the Comprehensive Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Develop broad policy objectives2. Generate relatively detailed maps based on those objectives3. Crosscheck that the maps do in fact match up to the overall objectives <p>We are now at the point in the process where checking the maps against the overall community goals is vitally important, and we would like to provide suggestions on what additional information is needed to conduct a thorough crosscheck.</p> <p>The Alliance agrees that an important first step is to generate a detailed description of the goals for the future of each Character District. You have already identified the location and type of development desired in each area of every district, and determining the desired amount of this development will complete the picture. This is an important step because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Determining the amount of development desired in each sub-district would enable the community to immediately verify whether the maps are in line with the concrete goals we have established in the policies, including the goal for a 60/40% split on rural/complete neighborhood development, the goal to house 65% of our workforce, and the goal of not exceeding a doubling of current development.• This information forms the foundation for analysis of a range of other issues, including the projected impacts of this development on wildlife, the expected effects on traffic, the fiscal impacts of new development, and the economic viability of commercial endeavors in the area.• Numerical objectives for future development in each district would provide greater predictability, and would make the Comp Plan more understandable to the general public. <p>We understand that the discussion about buildout numbers became very heated in recent years. We recognize that this is not intended to be a “numbers-based plan,” yet the public was told that numbers would “fall out of the mapping process.” There is now an opportunity to provide numerical objectives as part of the description of each sub-district in the Character District Maps.</p> <p>We encourage you to ask the planning staff to provide estimates of the amount of future development that is desired in each sub-district. This step would reduce the confusion that will be generated if people make their own independent estimates, and will clearly illustrate what the plan means for our future.</p> <p>Over the next few days, you will see a newspaper ad by the Conservation Alliance asking whether the maps accurately illustrate the community’s overall goals. Answering this fundamental question is now within reach, and clearly providing answers on the expected amount and location of development is vital to getting the support of the community before the adoption of the Comp Plan.</p> <p>The Conservation Alliance has advocated for responsible planning for 33 years. In order for the Alliance to explain to residents why development regulations are important to the community’s ability to preserve wildlife, scenery, and community character, we need to be able to show people how some trade-offs in their neighborhood contribute to achieving the major priorities of the community as a whole. We believe that residents will support the Comp Plan if they can see how increased development in some areas enables conservation of other areas, and achieves overall community goals.</p> <p>Please give the planning staff the green light to provide this information to you, and to the community, to foster better understanding of the Comp Plan, and better decisions based on that data.</p>